DA 912
.D23

A

CATECHISM

OF THE

HISTORY OF IRELAND,

ANCIENT AND MODERN.

BY WILLIAM J. O'NEILL DAUNT, ESQ.

AUTHOR OF "SAINTS AND SINNERS."

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY PATRICK DONAHOE,
No. 1 Spring Lane.
1850.

DA912
.D23

Exchange
Western Ontario Univ.
11/5/36

ADVERTISEMENT

TO

THE AMERICAN EDITION.

The following pages are the production of an able and enthusiastic young Irish patriot. He has served Ireland well with voice and pen, and the Father of his country as a confidential secretary. It is, therefore, in every respect a national work, and the very best key we have ever seen to the study of the wonderful history of that nation. Its brevity omits nothing of real importance which could be thus glanced at, while the admirable connection of the whole charms the memory from forgetfulness of any portion of its contents.

This well-timed work was not more needed in Ireland than it is in America. We are, with very, very few exceptions, infants in the

study of Irish history — the most interesting of any relating to Western Europe. Let us begin with the beginning. It is full time our fellow-citizens should know something of an island which has been a fruitful source of population and benefit to the new world — from whose children millions around and among them are descended, and from which the tide of emigration still sets steadily towards these shores. To those emigrants themselves this Catechism will be most welcome; and the more thoroughly they study its pages, the farther they will advance to the perfection of all earthly philosophy — the knowledge of themselves.

PREFACE.

I INTEND this little Catechism for a school-book. I hope it may help to train up Irish children "in the way in which they should go." I have often been thoroughly disgusted at the deceptive character of those quasi-historical abstracts which are put into the hands of our youth, and which are calculated to create in their minds a contempt for their own brave and gallant Celtic forefathers, a political idolatry of England, and a total misconception of the real, substantial interests of their native land.

It was necessarily impossible, in a compilation so limited in extent as the present, to enter into full details of historical incidents. The outlines of our national annals are all that could be given; accompanied, sometimes,

by a brief word of comment, meant to guide the youthful student with respect to the *moral* of his country's history. School-books about Ireland have too often been designed to train their readers to look through English spectacles at Irish transactions. *I* have looked at those transactions through an Irish medium; I have sought to extend, to the rising generation, that teaching which has been disseminated with such potent efficacy among their seniors, by my able friends who conduct the NATION newspaper; being deeply convinced that the welfare of the country, and the cause of political truth, can alone be promoted and secured by infusing into the hearts of its inhabitants the sacred principle of nationality.

Of religious differences, except so far as they have affected politics, I have said nothing whatever. Some of the best and warmest Irish patriots are, and have been, Protestants. There is nothing in any Christian creed to prevent its professors from working honestly and efficiently for their country.

I have not screened the faults and follies of our ancestors. Their great and noble qualities were too often neutralized by their sin of mutual dissension. It is true that in this respect they were not worse than the contemporary inhabitants of other lands; but the evils arising from internal differences have, from peculiar circumstances, been more grievous and enduring in Ireland than almost in any other country. It is time that *party* should be merged in *nationality*.

There exists not on the surface of the earth a nation richer than our own in all the moral and physical resources of greatness, prosperity, and happiness; or more fertile in all the materials of self-government. Every page of our history impresses the conviction, that, if intestine divisions were abandoned; if men would use the energies and powers God has given them for the common benefit, instead of for the purposes of faction; if, instead of a miserable strife to exalt Whig over Tory, or Tory over Whig, all parties would unite to

exalt Ireland, by restoring to her legislative freedom; then we should see those great qualities, which now lie nearly dormant, called forth into active exercise, and productive of unnumbered blessings to our fatherland.

W. J. O'NEILL DAUNT

Kilcascan, County Cork,
23d September, 1844.

CATECHISM

OF THE

HISTORY OF IRELAND.

CHAPTER I.

Of the Original Inhabitants of Ireland.

Question. Whence was Ireland first peopled?

Answer. There are many accounts of the origin of her earliest inhabitants; the most probable belief is, that Ireland was peopled by a colony of Phœnicians.

Q. Who were the Phœnicians?

A. They were a branch of the great nation of the Scythians.

Q. How did the early inhabitants divide Ireland?

A. Into five kingdoms.

Q. Name them.

A. Ulster, Leinster, Connaught, Munster, and Meath.

Q. How were these five kingdoms governed?

A. Each by its own prince; and the king of Meath was also paramount sovereign of all Ireland.

Q. Did these kingdoms descend from father to son by hereditary right?

A. No; the succession was regulated by the law of Tanistry

Q. What was Tanistry?

A. Tanistry was a law which restricted the right of succession to the family of the prince, or chief; but any member of the family might be elected successor, as well as the eldest son.

Q. What does tanist mean?

A. Tanist was the title borne by the elected successor, during the life of the reigning prince, or chief.

Q. What qualities was it necessary that the tanist should possess?

A. He should be a knight, full twenty-five years old; his figure should be tall, noble, and free from blemish; and he should prove his pedigree from the Milesians.

Q. Was Tanistry a good custom?

A. No; for the struggles of the different candidates, to be elected, caused great warfare and bloodshed.

Q. Where did the king-paramount of all Ireland reside?

A. At the palace of Tara, in Meath.

Q. What was the ancient law of Ireland called?

A. The Brehon Law.*

Q. What was most remarkable in the Brehon Law?

A. The nearly total absence of capital punishment.

Q. How was murder punished?

A. By a money-fine, called an *eric.*

Q. Had the lenity of the Brehon Law in that respect a good effect?

A. Not always: for the friends of the mur-

* *Brehiv* is the modern Irish for a judge.

dered person often deemed the penalty inflicted by the law too slight; and in avenging their own wrongs, bloody feuds and clan-battles often occurred.

Q. How were men appointed to the office of brehon?

A. The office of brehon was hereditary in certain families.

Q. Were the other great offices in Ireland, in like manner, restricted to certain families?

A. Yes; in those days all great offices were thus restricted.

Q. Can you state any ancient custom of those early times which still exists in Ireland?

A. Yes; the custom of *fostering*. The children of the chiefs and nobles were always suckled by the wives of the tenants.

Q. Was the link thus formed considered a strong one?

A. As strong as the tie of actual relationship. Nay, foster-brothers and foster-sisters often loved each other better than if they had been the children of the same parents.

Q. Can you mention any other ancient custom?

A. Yes; that of *gossipred*. The chiefs and nobles frequently became godfathers to the children of their vassals and dependents.

Q. Had these old customs any good effect?

A. They had: they helped in some degree to connect different classes in the bonds of affection with each other.

Q. Are there any remarkable remains of early Irish buildings?

A. Yes; there are fifty-two round towers in Ireland of a very high antiquity

Q. What was the origin and purpose of those buildings?

A. Both their origin and purpose are unknown: there is, however, a rather probable opinion that they were intended for the fire-worship of the pagans, before the Christian religion was brought into Ireland.

Q. Are there similar round towers in any other part of the British islands?

A. No; excepting two which still remain in Scotland.

CHAPTER II.

The Irish Christian Church.

Question. Who was the first Christian Bishop with local jurisdiction in Ireland?

Answer. Saint Palladius.

Q. By whom was he appointed?

A. By Pope Celestine, in the year 430.*

Q. Whence did the whole Irish nation receive its Christianity?

A. From Rome.

Q. Who states these facts?

A. They are stated by many ancient historians of the highest credit; namely, by Saint Prosper of Acquitaine, in the year 434; by Saint Columbanus, an Irish prelate, A. D. 610; by the Abbot Cummian, another Irishman, in the year 650; by

* The earliest chronicler of this fact is SAINT PROSPER, of Acquitaine, *Chron.* ad annum, 434, tom. 1.—Rer. Gal. Fol. Paris, 1738, p. 630. His words are, "*Ad Scotas in Christum credentes ordinatur à Papa Celestino Palladius, et primus Episcopus mittitur.*" "Scoti" was then, and for a long time after, the exclusive designation of the Irish people.

the Venerable Bede, an English monk and historian, A. D. 701; by Probus, an Irish writer of the ninth century; by the Annals of the Four Masters; by Marianus Scotus, an Irish writer in the year 1059; and by Saint Sigebert, the monk of Gemblours, who wrote in or about the year 1101.

Q. What are the words of Saint Prosper of Acquitaine?

A. He says: "By Pope Celestine is Palladius ordained and sent the first bishop to the Irish believing in Christ."

Q. What are the words of Saint Columbanus?

A. Saint Columbanus wrote a letter to Pope Boniface the Fourth, in which he thus speaks to that Pontiff: "As your friend, your scholar, your servant, not as a stranger, will I speak; therefore, as to our masters, to the steersmen, to the mystic pilots of the spiritual ship, will I freely speak, saying, Watch, for the sea is stormy; watch, for the water has already gotten into the ship of the church, and the ship is in danger!" *

Q. What do you notice in these words?

A. I notice, that this Irish prelate acknowledges the Roman Pontiffs to have been the spiritual teachers of the Irish Christian church; and also that he begs of the Pope to defend that church from the dangers that beset it.

Q. Who was Cummian?

A. He was an Irish abbot, in the seventh century.

Q. Did Cummian acknowledge that the Irish received their faith from Rome?

A. Yes.

* S. Columbani, *Epist. ad* Bonifacium IV. *Biblioth Vet. Pat.* t. xii. p. 532, *Ed.* Gallandio.

Q. What are his words?

A. He says: "We sent those persons whom we knew to be wise and humble men, to Rome, *as it were children to their mother.*" *

Q. What does the Venerable Bede say?

A. He says: "In the eighth year of the reign of Theodosius the Younger, Palladius was sent by Celestine, Pontiff of the Roman church, to the Irish believing in Christ, as their first bishop." †

Q. What are the words of Probus, the Irish writer of the ninth century?

A. He says: "The Archdeacon Palladius was ordained and sent to this island (Ireland) by Celestine, the forty-fifth Pope who occupied the apostolic chair in succession from Saint Peter." ‡

Q. What does Probus call Rome?

A. "The head of all churches." ‡

Q. Do the ancient annals of Innisfallen attest the connection of the early Irish church with that of Rome?

A. They do.

Q. In what manner?

A. They tell us that, in 402, two Irishmen, Kiaran and Declan, having sojourned in Rome, came thence to preach Christianity in Ireland; that, in 412, St. Ailbe, of Emly, came from Rome to announce the faith in Ireland; and that, in 420, Ibar Invarensis (another Irishman who had studied in Rome) came thence to Ireland. §

Q. Have we got traces of any earlier con-

* Cummianus Hibernus. A. D. 650. *apud* Usserium, *Vet. Epis. Hibern. Sylloge*, p. 13.

† Ven. Bedæ, *Hist. Eccles. gentis Anglorum*, l. 1, c. 13.

‡ Probus, *de Vita S. Patricii, apud* Bedam. p. 315, t. iii.—*Basil*, 1573.

§ O'Connor, *Rer. Hibern. Script.* t. ii. *in Annal.* Innisfall. pp. 12, 13.

nection than this between the Irish and the Roman Christians?

A. Yes; so far back as the year 360, a certain Christian priest had been sent from Rome to Ireland, to teach the Christian faith there; and it was from that priest that Saint Ailbe of Emly received baptism.*

Q. Who was Marianus Scotus, and when did he flourish?

A. He was an Irish scholar and writer, and he flourished about the year 1059.

Q. What are his words?

A. He says that, "in the year of Christ 432, to the Irish believing in Christ, Palladius, ordained by Pope Celestine, was sent the first bishop. After him SAINT PATRICK, who was a Gaul by birth, and consecrated by Pope Celestine, is sent to the Irish archiepiscopacy."†

Q. There were Christians in Ireland, then, before the arrival of Palladius and Patrick?

A. Yes; a very small and scattered number.

Q. By whom had that small number of Irish Christians been first taught the faith?

A. Probably by the Roman priest who visited Ireland in 360, and who baptized Saint Ailbe of Emly.

Q. Who was the great apostle of the faith to the Irish nation?

A. Saint Patrick.

Q. Where was he born?

A. At Boulogne, in Armoric Gaul.

Q. Who was his father?

A. Calphurnius.

* USSERII. *Britan. Eccles. Antiq. Index Chronologicus*, p. 512, *et ex vita S. Albei, ib.* p. 409.

† MARIANUS SCOTUS, *Chron.* ad annum, ed. *Basile.* 1559.

Q. Was Calphurnius in holy orders?

A. Not at the time of his son's birth. He was then a layman; but at a later period he separated from his wife, and took holy orders in the church.

Q. On what authority do you state these facts?

A. On the authority of the ancient writer of Saint Patrick's life, Joceline.*

Q. Had Saint Patrick great success in his mission?

A. His success was perfect. He converted the entire of Ireland to the Christian religion; thus gloriously finishing the work of Saint Palladius.

Q. Did Saint Patrick teach spiritual obedience to the Pope?

A. He did. Among the canons or rules made in the synods which he called together, and over which he presided, we find it ordained, "*that if any questions arise in this island, they are to be referred to the Apostolic See.*"†

Q. Did other prelates of the early Irish church practise the obedience to the Pope which Saint Patrick taught?

A. They did.

Q. How does the Irish Saint Columbanus, in the sixth century, address Pope Gregory the Great?

A. He calls him the "*Holy Lord and Roman Father in Christ;*" "*—the chosen Watchman,*

* "Postquam vero aliquantum processerant in diebus suis (Parentis S. Patricii) fælici generatione completa, communi consensu, castitati studuerunt, et sancto fine in Domino quieverunt. Calphurnius autem prius in Diaconatu diutius Domino servavit, postremo in Presbyteratu vitam finivit."—*Jocelinus Vit. S. Patric. C.* i.

† "Si quæ questiones in hac insula oriantur, ad sedem Apostolicam referantur."—*Canones* S. Patricii, *apud* Wilkins; *Concil. Mag. Brit.* t. i. p. 6.

possessed of the divine theory of the treasurer-ship;" — he speaks of him as *"lawfully sitting in the chair of Saint Peter the Apostle;"* and he begs the Pope to decide for him how he ought to act in certain cases.*

Q. How does Saint Columbanus address Saint Gregory's successor, Pope Boniface the Fourth?

A. He calls him *"The Holy Lord, and in Christ the Apostolic Father."* †

Q. Does Saint Columbanus elsewhere recognize the Pope's supremacy?

A. Yes. In another letter to Pope Boniface IV., he calls him *"the head of all the churches of the whole of Europe;"* he also terms the Pope *"the Pastor of pastors."* ‡ In the same letter, Columbanus says, *"We are, as I said before, bound to the chair of Saint Peter. For though Rome is great and renowned, it is through this chair only that she is great and bright amongst us."* §

Q. Did not a dispute arise in the Irish church about the time when Easter ought to be kept?

A. Yes; towards the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century.

Q. What did the Irish abbot, Cummian, say with regard to that dispute?

A. Cummian quoted Saint Jerome's words: "I cry out, whosoever is joined to the chair of Saint Peter, that man is mine! — What more? I turn

* S. COLUMBANI, *Epist.* i. *ad Gregorium Papam*, inter opera S. COLUMBANI, apud GALLANDII, *Bib. Vet. Pat.* t. xii. p. 345.

† *Ibid.* p. 349.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 349—354.

§ VENERABLE BEDE. *Hist. Eccles. Gentis. Anglor. l.* ii. c. xix. p. 148, ed. Stevenson. Lon. 1838; also *Epist. S. Greg.* l. ii. c. iv.

me to the words of the bishop of the city of Rome, Pope Gregory, received by us in common." *

Q. Did the Irish Christians fall into a wrong mode of computing Easter?

A. They did.

Q. Who reclaimed the Irish from that error?

A. Pope Honorius, about the year 628.†

Q. Did the Irish resist the Pope's settlement of this question among them?

A. So far from that, they yielded to it a ready and cheerful obedience.

Q. Had Pope Honorius a legate in Ireland about this time? (628.)

A. Yes. He appointed Saint Lasrean, an Irish prelate, his legate in Ireland.

Q. Do we find other proofs, in history, of the close connection between the early Irish Christians and the Apostolic Chair?

A. Yes. The missionaries from Ireland used to go to Rome to do homage to the Pope, and beg his leave and his blessing, before they went to preach to pagan nations.

Q. Do you know the names of any who did so?

A. Yes. Saint Dichul, or Deicolus, did so. About the year 686, Saint Killian and his companion missionaries did so. Saint Willibrord (a saint of English birth, who had long lived in Ireland) did so.

Q. Did Irish bishops take part in Roman councils?

* Cummiani Hiberni ad Segienum Huensem Abbatem, *de Controversiæ Paschali Epistola,* apud Usserium, *Vet. Epist. Hibern. Sylloge.*

† This is stated by Archbishop Usher, in his work "*De Brittanicarum Ecclesiarum Primordiis.* p. 938.

A. Yes.

Q. State an instance.

A. Among the bishops who attended the council held at Rome by Pope Gregory II., in the year 721, were Sedulius, an Irishman, bishop in Britain; and Fergustus the Pict, bishop in Ireland.

Q. What means were taken to get Waterford made a bishop's see?

A. King Murtogh, his brother Dermod, and the four bishops, Domnald, Idunan (of Meath), Samuel (of Dublin), and Ferdomnach (of Leinster), petitioned Anselm, the archbishop of Canterbury, to erect Waterford into a bishopric.

Q. Why did they apply to the archbishop of Canterbury?

A. Because he had, at that time, primatial authority over the Irish Christian church, as well as over the English.

Q. What was the language of the applicants?

A. They begged Anselm would appoint a bishop, "in virtue of the power of primacy which he held over them, *and of the authority of the apostolic function which he exercised.*" *

Q. Did Anselm indicate the Pope's primacy, in his communications to the Irish prelates?

A. Of course he did. In writing to the bishop of Dublin, (the aforesaid Samuel,) he says to him, "I have heard that thou hast a cross borne before thee on the highways. If this be true, I order thee to do so no more, because this belongeth only to an archbishop confirmed by the pall from the Roman Pontiff." †

* *Primatus quem super eos gerebat potestate. et* QUA FUNGEBATUR VICIS APOSTOLICÆ AUCTORITATE." EADMERI, *Historiæ Novorum*, l. ii. p. 36. ed. Seldeno. London, 1623.

† ANSELMUS ARCHIEPISCOPUS CANTUARIÆ, *venerabili*

Q. What was the language of Gilbert, bishop of Limerick, in the year 1090?

A. He says: "All the church's members are to be brought under one bishop, namely, Christ, and his vicar, blessed Peter the Apostle, and the Pope presiding in his chair, to be governed by them."

Q. Does this ancient Irish bishop add anything more on this subject?

A. Yes; his words are: "To Peter only was it said, '*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church;*' therefore, it is the Pope only who stands high above the whole church; and he puts in order and judges all." *

Q. What remarkable occurrence took place in the twelfth century?

A. Malachi, the primate of all Ireland, visited Rome, and was appointed, by Pope Innocent the Second, his legate in Ireland.

Q. What was the particular purpose of his visit to Rome?

A. To obtain from the Pope the honor of the pall, or *pallium*, for the Irish archbishops.

Q. What was the *pallium?*

A. An ensign of legatine authority.

Q. What was the Pope's answer?

A. He told Malachi that he would grant his request, but that it should first be made by the general body of the Irish prelates assembled in synod.†

fratro Samueli Dublini civitatis Episcopo. Apud USSERIUM, *Vet. Epist. Hibern. Sylloge*, p. 69.

* *De Usu Ecclesiastico* — GILLEBERTI LUNICENSIS (Limerick) *Episcopi, Epistola ad Episcopos Hiberniæ*, apud USSERIUM, *Vet. Epist. Hibern. Sylloge*, p. 54, et passim.

† *Vita* S. MALACHIÆ a S Bernardo, *apud* Surium, *tom.* vi. p. 100.

Q. Was this promise fulfilled?

A. Not immediately; for, on Malachi's next journey to Rome, to obtain the performance of the promise, he fell sick and died at Clairvaux, in France, in 1148.

Q. Were the palls granted?

A. Yes. Pope Eugenius the Third granted that privilege, through his nuncio, Cardinal Paparo, who visited Ireland in the year 1151.

Q. What happened the following year?

A. A council was held at Kells, at which there were twenty-four Irish prelates, and Cardinal Paparo presided; and Ireland was there divided into four archbishopricks.

Q. Name them.

A. Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam.

Q. When was the council of Cashel held?

A. In the year 1172.

Q. Did any other event of importance happen in that year?

A. Yes; Henry II., king of England, landed in this country, and received the allegiance of several Irish prelates and princes, as king of Ireland.

Q. Was that allegiance tendered to Henry by the council of Cashel?

A. No; the council of Cashel had nothing to do with it; the allegiance of the prelates had been tendered to Henry at Waterford.

Q. What were the decrees of the council of Cashel?

A. They were aimed against certain evils of the time, such as marriages performed within the forbidden degrees of relationship; informality and carelessness in baptism; extortion committed by

powerful laymen on the church-lands; neglect of due solemnity at burials, &c.

Q. Was there any other important decree of the council of Cashel?

A. Yes; it enforced the payment of tithes to the clergy.

Q. Had tithes existed in Ireland previously?

A. Yes; they had been introduced twenty years before, at the council of Kells, held under Cardinal Paparo.

CHAPTER III.

Invasion of Ireland by the Danes.

Q. When did the Danes invade Ireland?

A. In the ninth century.

Q. By what name were they known?

A. They were called Eastmen, or Ostmen.

Q. Did they succeed in subduing the country?

A. Their success was at first only partial. They soon, however, seized upon towns and villages along the coast, and built castles to strengthen their position.

Q. Did they soon become more powerful?

A. Yes; before long they overran the whole island.

Q. Who was the Danish king of Ireland?

A. Turgesius.

Q. How was he enabled to conquer the whole kingdom?

A. By the disputes and divisions of the Irish chiefs themselves. The native princes were too busy, quarrelling with each other, to oppose a

united and effectual resistance to the conquering Danes.

Q. What useful lesson do we learn from this fact?

A. That Ireland never can be great, prosperous, or happy, so long as her people are divided amongst themselves.

Q. Did Turgesius reign long?

A. No. He was soon cut off by the contrivance of an Irish prince to whom he had made himself obnoxious.

Q. What followed?

A. The Irish revolted against the Danes; and, as they combined together tolerably well, they drove the invaders out of the centre of the country to the coasts; where, however, they still kept possession of the seaports.

Q. Did the Danes ever recover their former power in Ireland?

A. No. In the eleventh century, the Irish resolved to make a grand effort for their final expulsion from the island; and a battle was fought on the plains of Clontarf, near Dublin, on Good Friday, 1014, in which the Danes were driven to their ships with great slaughter.

Q. Who was the leader of the Irish army upon that occasion?

A. Brian Boroimhe, king-paramount of Ireland, the greatest and best king that Ireland ever saw.

Q. Did he live to enjoy the fruits of his victory?

A. No; he was slaughtered, while at prayer in his tent, by a straggling party of the enemy.

Q. What was the result of Brian Boroimhe's death upon the general interests of the kingdom?

A. In the last degree disastrous. On the death

of the monarch, whose skill and wisdom had for many years governed the land in prosperity and peace, the absurd and criminal squabbles of the petty princes were revived, and the country was ravaged with intestine warfare.

Q. Is there any use in recording and dwelling on these disgraceful contentions?

A. Yes; they teach us a useful, though a bitter, lesson. The crimes of our forefathers show us what we should avoid. We see, in their miserable domestic quarrels, the true cause why foreign power was able to introduce, and to establish, its supremacy in Ireland.

Q. Did the unsettled condition of the country afford strong encouragement to the English king, Henry the Second?

A. Of course it did. Several of the Irish princes, and all the Irish prelates, wearied with perpetual civil discord, were not unwilling that the kingdom should be placed under a strong sovereign ruler; and this circumstance gained a welcome for Henry from the heads of the church, and a large number of the temporal rulers of the island.

Q. What circumstance first drew the British invaders to Ireland?

A. Dermot, king of Leinster, having been driven out of his kingdom by O'Rorke, prince of Breffny, and O'Connor, king of Connaught, sought the assistance of Henry the Second of England against his native rivals.

Q. In what year did Dermot thus seek help from Henry?

A. In 1168.

Q. How did Henry receive Dermot's application?

A. He required the Irish king to do homage to him for his possessions; and being then unable to go to Ireland himself, he gave Dermot letters-patent, authorizing any English subjects, who might be so inclined, to assist Dermot against O'Connor and O'Rorke.

Q. Whose assistance did Dermot procure?

A. That of Richard, Earl of Strigul and Pembroke, usually called Strongbow, from his skill in archery.

Q. What reward did Dermot promise Strongbow for his help?

A. He promised to give him his daughter Eva in marriage, and also to bequeath to him the inheritance of his kingdom.

Q. Did Dermot obtain any other help than Strongbow's?

A. Yes; he got the aid of Robert Fitz-Stephen, Maurice Fitz-Gerald, Meyler Fitz-Henry, Maurice de Prendergast, Hervey Montmarisco, and several other knights.

Q. When did the Anglo-Norman invaders first land in Ireland?

A. They landed on the coast of Wexford in the month of May, 1170.

Q. Was Strongbow among their number?

A. No; he had waited to obtain the express permission of King Henry for his Irish expedition.

Q. Did Henry grant permission to Strongbow to go to Ireland?

A. No; he was jealous of Strongbow, and doubted his allegiance.

Q. What did Strongbow then do?

A. He sailed for Ireland *without* Henry's permission, carrying with him a considerable force, with whose aid he seized Waterford.

Q. What followed?

A. Strongbow married Eva, the daughter of Dermot Mac Murrough, king of Leinster; and, on Dermot's death, he succeeded to his father-in-law's territory.

Q. In what year did Henry visit Ireland?

A. In 1171. He pardoned Strongbow, and confirmed to him the possession of his territories under the English crown.

Q. Did the Pope sanction Henry the Second in his invasion of Ireland?

A. Yes; Pope Adrian the Fourth had, many years before, (about A. D. 1155,) been solicited by Henry to sanction the conquest of Ireland; and being himself an Englishman, he readily consented to a scheme that promised to extend the power of his native country.

Q. Did all the Irish submit to King Henry the Second?

A. No; the larger portion of them resisted his authority.

Q. Were the English laws extended to the whole of Ireland?

A. No; they were at first granted only to the Norman colonists, to some of the seaport towns, and to a few native septs, or clans, who obtained the benefit of them as a matter of favor.

Q. How many clans obtained the benefit of the English laws?

A. Five.

Q. Name them.

A. The O'Neills of Ulster, the O'Connors of Connaught, the O'Briens of Thomond, the O'Lachlans of Meath, and the Kavanaghs (otherwise Mac Murroughs) of Leinster.

Q. How long did this exclusion of the great

body of the natives, from the benefit of the English law, continue?

A. For several centuries; so late, in fact, as the reign of Elizabeth.

Q. What was the practical effect of this exclusion?

A. To deprive the whole Irish nation, (excepting the five tribes already mentioned, the descendants of the colonists, and the inhabitants of the seaports,) of all remedy in law for any injury done to them, and even of all power of suing for redress in any court of justice.

Q. Was not an effort made by the natives to expel the Anglo-Norman invaders?

A. Yes; and their hopes were excited by a victory they had gained over Strongbow, the English commander, who was defeated in an engagement near Thurles.

Q. Who was at the head of the new confederacy against the invaders?

A. Roderick O'Connor, king-paramount of Ireland.

Q. Did Roderick succeed?

A. No; his efforts were marred by the old curse of Ireland — the want of unity and combination amongst her inhabitants.

Q. Had the Anglo-Normans any other advantage over the natives, except that which they derived from the dissensions of the latter?

A. Yes; they understood the art of war much better than the Irish. They were clad in complete suits of steel armor, and were perfect in the management of their chargers: whereas, the Irish had but slight defences, and had merely the rude weapons of their forefathers to oppose to the array and discipline of their powerful invaders.

Q. What was thenceforth the condition of Ireland?

A. Most wretched. There was constant warfare between the natives and the settlers; in which the victory was sometimes with the Irish. They were brave and ardent, and often made their enemies (although cased in armor) feel the weight of their rude and simple weapons.

Q. What were the weapons of the Irish warriors?

A. They had a short lance, or javelin, and a steel hatchet, named a "*sparthe.*" They acquired so much skill in the use of this sparthe, that in close combat they often clove through the steel armor of their adversaries with it.

Q. What were the houses of the Irish built of at that period?

A. Of timber and wicker-work, and constructed with such skill as to excite the admiration of foreigners.

Q. What was the state of religion in Ireland in the twelfth century?

A. Religion, of course, suffered severely by the license and havoc resulting from domestic warfare; and its precepts were too often forgotten and neglected by the turbulent factions who divided the country.

Q. What was at that time the character of the clergy of Ireland?

A. The ancient historian, Giraldus Cambrensis, although extremely prejudiced against the Irish nation, yet describes the clergy as being most virtuous.

Q. What good qualities does he ascribe to the Irish priesthood?

A. He says they were preëminently chaste,* temperate in their food, and attentive to their religious duties. He, however, censures the bishops as slothful; an accusation not easily reconciled with the admitted virtues of the priesthood from whose ranks they had risen to the episcopacy.

Q. Who was Laurence O'Toole?

A. One of the best and greatest prelates who have adorned the Irish church. He was archbishop of Dublin, and afterwards of Armagh.

Q. What was his conduct in reference to the English invasion?

A. He exerted himself to rouse the Irish chiefs and princes to a grand combined effort to resist the English invaders, and even bore arms himself to encourage his countrymen.

Q. When, and where, did this good prelate die?

A. He died in 1178, at the monastery of Eu, in Normandy.

CHAPTER IV.

The Reign of Henry the Second concluded.

Q. What are the earliest traces we have of parliaments in Ireland?

A. About the year 1169 we find Roderick O'Connor, king-paramount of Ireland, convoking a general council of the princes and nobles of the land at Tara. But this council did not possess

* "Inter varias quibus pollet virtutes, castitatis prerogativa præeminet atque præcellet." c. 27.

the representative character which attaches to the modern house of commons.

Q. Did Henry the Second call a parliament in Ireland?

A. He did; and that parliament passed a law arranging the executive government of Ireland.*

Q. Was Ireland peaceful during Henry's reign?

A. It was at the commencement of it, so long as Henry remained in Ireland to overawe resistance by his presence.

Q. How long did he remain in Ireland?

A. Six months.

Q. After he quitted it, what occurred?

A. Civil war succeeded the short peace which had prevailed during his stay.

Q. How did it arise?

A. From the discontent excited by the grasping rapacity of Henry and his followers.

Q. Give an example of this.

A. He granted away the entire kingdom of Meath, the royal patrimony of the house of Melachlin, to Hugh De Lacy, an Anglo-Norman knight.

Q. What was the extent of land thus transferred to De Lacy?

A. About eight hundred thousand acres.

* "The statute, 2 Richard III. c. 8, recites as follows: 'Que le *Statute* de Henry Fitz Emprice,' [Henry the Second] 'ordeine pour la eleccion del gouvernor,' &c., had made several regulations for supplying occasional vacancies in that office. It then proceeds to amend the same. Here, therefore, we have an evidence of a purely legislative enactment of primary importance, made in Ireland, arranging the executive government itself, and coeval with the supposed conquest of the kingdom." *Mr. Monck Mason's Essay on the Constitution and Antiquity of Parliaments in Ireland.* p. 3, Dublin, 1820.

Q. In whose occupation had this territory been, prior to Henry's seizure of it?

A. In that of O'Ruarc, to whom it had been temporarily given by Roderick O'Connor.

Q. Did O'Ruarc endeavor to obtain amends?

A. Yes; he asked redress from Hugh de Lacy, who appointed Tara Hill for a conference. They met, with a stipulated number of followers upon each side. The two chiefs, unarmed, and at a distance from all the rest, conferred together with the help of an interpreter.

Q. Did their conference end peaceably?

A. No; a strife arose, and O'Ruarc was slain by a relation of De Lacy's named Griffith. His corpse was beheaded, and buried with the heels upwards, in token of contempt. His head was exposed on a stake over one of the gates of Dublin, and finally sent to England, to the king.

Q. Where did the celebrated Strongbow at this time reside?

A. At Ferns, in Leinster, the residence of his father-in-law, King Dermot Mac Murrough.

Q. Was he engaged in civil war with any of the native chiefs?

A. Yes; with O'Dempsey O'Faley.

Q. What was the cause of quarrel?

A. O'Faley had refused to attend the court of Strongbow; whereupon the latter invaded his territory.

Q. With what success?

A. Strongbow, at first, being unresisted, spread destruction in his progress. But on his return he was attacked by O'Faley, at the head of a party, who slew a number of the Strongbownian knights, including Strongbow's son-in-law, De Quincy, and captured the standard of Leinster.

Q. In what year did that skirmish occur?

A. In 1173.

Q. Did any commotions take place in the following year?

A. Yes. In 1174 Strongbow sent his relation, Hervey de Mount-Maurice, to attack Donald O'Brian, king of Limerick. A large reënforcement of Strongbow's army, however, were surprised at Ossory, and almost totally destroyed, by a party whom Donald O'Brian commanded.

Q. What was Strongbow's revenge for this defeat?

A. He sent Raymond, one of his best military commanders, with a large force, to besiege Limerick. The assailants succeeded in taking the town, notwithstanding a gallant defence.

Q. How long did the English keep Limerick?

A. Until May, 1176. Raymond was then obliged to repair to Dublin, Strongbow having died; and being unable to leave a sufficient force to occupy Limerick, he surrendered it back to Donald O'Brian; pretending to rely on O'Brian's future loyalty to the king of England.

Q. How did Donald O'Brian act, on obtaining possession of the town?

A. Ere Raymond's forces were out of sight, Donald set fire to the town, saying "that it should never again be made a nest of foreigners."

Q. Where was Strongbow buried?

A. In the cathedral of Christ Church, Dublin.

Q. Did Meath continue peaceful all this time?

A. By no means. De Lacy had given the castle of Slane, in Meath, to one of his followers, named Fleming. The Irish chief who had been dispossessed surprised the English garrison and

inhabitants of Slane, put them all to the sword, and recovered possession of his castle.

Q. What further results followed?

A. The English, in Meath, were so terrified, that the garrisons of three other castles, built by Fleming in that territory, evacuated them on the following day.

Q. Did King Henry enter into a treaty with Roderick O'Connor, king-paramount of Ireland?

A. He did, in 1175.

Q. What were the terms of this treaty?

A. Henry was bound to protect Roderick in possession of his territories, provided that Roderick consented to hold them as Henry's tributary. Roderick, on the other hand, was bound to compel the Irish princes to pay tribute which was to pass through his hands to Henry. In case of any rebellion against Henry, Roderick was empowered, by the terms of the treaty, to judge and punish the insurgents.

Q. What was the amount of tribute stipulated?

A. One hide for every ten head of cattle slaughtered within the kingdom.

Q. Was this treaty observed?

A. No; in the turmoil and confusion of the times its observance was impossible.

Q. Did the Irish and their invaders blend into one nation?

A. Not at that period. The greatest hatred, in general, animated the two races against each other.

Q. What, then, prevented the Irish from combining to drive the invaders out of the land?

A. They were too busy quarrelling with each other for any such great national effort. Their bravery, their enterprise, their mental abilities

were all rendered unavailing by their unhappy internal divisions. It often happened that they joined the English forces, and fought in their ranks against some hostile native chieftain.

Q. Did not the English also often contend against each other?

A. Yes; English troops were sometimes to be found on opposite sides fighting in the ranks of contending Irish chiefs; and the English leaders themselves were occasionally influenced, by their mutual jealousies, to assume an attitude of armed hostility against each other.

Q. Did not some of the new settlers intermarry with the native Irish families?

A. Yes; we have seen that Strongbow married Eva, the daughter of Dermot Mac Murrough; and Hugh De Lacy, to whom Meath had been granted, married the daughter of King Roderick O'Connor. There were also several other such alliances.

Q. To whom did King Henry grant Ireland?

A. To his son John.

Q. What was John's character?

A. He was cruel, profligate, extravagant, and vain; destitute alike of moral principle and political wisdom.

Q. In what year did John arrive in Ireland?

A. He landed at Waterford in 1185.

Q. What was John's conduct?

A. He commenced by offering personal insults to the Irish chieftains who came to offer their respects to him as the son of their sovereign. He, and his courtiers, plucked their beards, ridiculed their dress and manners, mimicked their attitudes, and finally turned them out of the presence.

Q. How did the chiefs act?

A. They resented the insolence of John by a strong effort to throw off the Anglo-Norman power.

Q. How far did they succeed?

A. Their triumphs were partial. The prince of Limerick destroyed the English garrison of Ardfinnan. At Lismore, Robert De Barry and his entire troop were cut off. In Ossory, Roger De la Poer was slain, and his force destroyed. Two gallant knights, named Fitz-Hugh and Canton, were also slain by the Irish. The English garrison of Mogeva, in Tyrone, was routed with great slaughter by O'Loughlin, prince of that territory.

Q. Was the English power in Cork assailed by the natives?

A. Yes; M'Carthy, prince of Desmond, very nearly succeeded in capturing the city. He was, however, foiled by the gallant defence of Fitz-Walter.

Q. Was the English power in Meath attacked?

A. It was, by the northern Irish; who were with great loss and difficulty repulsed by William Petit.

Q. When King Henry learned these tidings, what steps did he take?

A. He recalled his foolish and profligate son, and appointed John De Courcy, earl of Ulster, lord deputy of Ireland.

Q. Did De Courcy put down the insurrection?

A. Yes. Even at this most critical juncture, the old curse of Ireland — the mutual quarrels of her chiefs — rendered them liable to easy defeat.

Q. What became of King Roderick O'Connor?

A. He was dethroned by his own sons, and ended his days in the monastery of Cong.

Q. What schools did he found and endow?
A. The schools of Armagh.
Q. When did King Henry die?
A. In the year 1189, at Chinon, in Normandy.

CHAPTER V.

The Reigns of Richard I., John, and Henry III.

Q. Who succeeded Henry as king of England?
A. His eldest son, Richard.
Q. Did King Richard assume the control of Ireland?
A. No; he left the management of the country to his brother John, to whom the late King Henry had granted it.
Q. What was John's first measure?
A. He began by removing De Courcy from the office of lord deputy, and appointing Hugh De Lacy to the government.
Q. What was the result of this step?
A. Open hatred on the part of De Courcy to his successor.
Q. Did De Lacy long continue lord deputy?
A. No. He was soon removed and replaced by William Petit, who, in turn, was displaced to make room for the late Earl Strongbow's son-in-law, William Earl Marshal.
Q. What steps did the Lord Deputy Earl Marshal take?
A. He proceeded to Munster, to subdue the insurgents there.
Q. With what success?
A. His campaign began unpromisingly. O'Bri-

an, prince of Thomond, encountered him at Thurles, and overthrew his forces, putting to the sword a great number of knights. The English were routed from Munster, with the sole exception of Cork, which was still retained by an English garrison.

Q. Did the Irish make any effort to obtain Cork?

A. Yes; M'Carthy of Desmond, who had previously been repulsed from Cork by the English garrison under Fitz-Walter, now renewed his attack on the city; the army sent to reënforce the defenders had been cut off by the Irish, and the garrison, having exhausted their provisions, surrendered to M'Carthy.

Q. Did the Irish chiefs improve this success to establish their own power on a lasting basis?

A. Unhappily not. M'Carthy, prince of Desmond, jealous of the power of O'Brian, prince of Thomond, actually invited the English to assist him against his rival, and even permitted them to build the castle of Breginnis in Desmond, the better to enable them to harass O' Brian!

Q. In what year did this occur?

A. About the year 1190.

Q. Why do we record these shameful squabbles?

A. Because they show us the true cause of Ireland's subjection to a foreign power. The Irish had numberless opportunities of establishing their own independence, and lost every one of them by their absurd and mischievous contentions.

Q. What do modern Irishmen learn from these facts?

A. They learn that, in order to regain their native parliament, it is absolutely necessary to

forget all past dissensions, and to work together as one man — cordially, heartily, perseveringly.

Q. You have said that some of the invading chiefs also quarrelled with each other: can you name any who did so?

A. Yes; Fitz-Aldelm De Burgo, the lord deputy, seized on Raymond Fitzgerald's castle of Wicklow.

Q. Was this the only case of the kind?

A. By no means. Fitz-Aldelm compelled Raymond Le Gros, and Robert Fitz-Stephen, to yield the lands they had originally got to newer invaders; and the dispossessed knights were obliged to content themselves with less profitable territories, in a more dangerous part of the country.

Q. Have you any other instances of dissension amongst the English in Ireland?

A. Yes; Meyler Fitz-Henry marched an army against De Burgo in Connaught; and De Lacy, at the head of a powerful force, attacked De Courcy in Ulster. De Lacy was also engaged in war against the young Earl of Pembroke, whose estates he had tried to seize.

Q. How did their struggle end?

A. Pembroke was destroyed by the treachery of Geoffry De Maurisco, an English knight, who had promised to support him, but who betrayed him by suddenly drawing off his forces at the moment of battle.

Q. Did the Fitzgerald family partake of this turbulence?

A. Yes; they actually seized on the lord deputy, (Richard De Capella,) and threw him into prison for his efforts to resist their usurpations. Civil war among the Anglo-Norman barons be-

came frequent; thus affording to the native Irish many opportunities of freedom, derived from the violent divisions of their invaders.

Q. In what year did King John die?

A. In the year 1216.

Q. What quarrels, about that time, disturbed Connaught?

A. De Burgo usurped certain lands of Feidlim O'Connor's; the king (Henry III.) interfered in behalf of O'Connor, and ordered the then lord deputy (Maurice Fitzgerald) to protect him from De Burgo's rapacity.

Q. Who built the magnificent cathedral of Cashel?

A. Donald O'Brian, prince of Thomond.

Q. In what year did he die?

A. In 1194.

Q. Did Henry the Third hold parliaments in Ireland?

A. Yes; he convened Irish parliaments in the years 1253 and 1269.

Q. What do you notice with respect to the Irish parliaments?

A. I notice, that the king's Irish subjects enjoyed a domestic parliament in Ireland from as early a period as his English subjects enjoyed a parliament in England.

Q. In what year did Henry the Third die?

A. In 1272.

CHAPTER VI.

The Reigns of Edward I., II., and III.

Q. What remarkable offer did the Irish make in the reign of Edward the First?

A. The Irish princes offered the king the sum of 8000 marks, provided that the rights of British subjects, enjoyed by the descendants of the English settlers, should be extended to the whole Irish nation.

Q. How did Edward treat the offer?

A. He was perfectly willing to grant the request.

Q. What prevented him from doing so?

A. The Irish lords of English descent opposed the king's wise plans and the wishes of the Irish people; for they believed that to extend the rights of British subjects to the whole nation would greatly abridge their own power to oppress and plunder.

Q. Was this offer ever repeated by the Irish?

A. Yes; often at later periods; and as often defeated by the influence of the Anglo-Irish lords.

Q. Did Edward the First hold a parliament in Ireland?

A. He did; in the year 1295.

Q. When did Edward die?

A. He died whilst marching against the Scotch, in 1307.

Q. What great victory did the Scotch gain over the English, in the reign of Edward the Second?

A. Under the command of Robert Bruce, they defeated the English at the battle of Bannockburn.

Q. How was this Scottish victory regarded in Ireland?

A. The chiefs of Ulster, regarding themselves as allied in Celtic kindred with the victors, were delighted at their triumph, and resolved to follow, if possible, so glorious an example.

Q. Did they make the attempt?

A. Yes; Edward Bruce, the brother of the Scottish king, landed on the eastern coast of Ulster in May, 1315, and was joined by the principal chiefs of Ulster.

Q. What followed?

A. They seized on several castles; burned Atherdee, Dundalk, and many other towns, and speedily banished the English out of Ulster.

Q. How did the barons act?

A. Many of them were willing to enter into terms with Bruce; and even the powerful house of De Lacy joined his standard.

Q. How did the clergy act?

A. A large number of them declared in favor of Bruce.

Q. What was Bruce's next step?

A. He got himself solemnly crowned king of Ireland, at Dundalk. He then marched southward, as provisions could no longer be procured for his army in the north.

Q. What Anglo-Norman lords opposed Edward Bruce?

A. Fitz-Thomas, the baron of O'Faley, and Butler, the lord deputy. Fitz-Thomas was rewarded by the king of England with the title of earl of Kildare, and Butler was created earl of Carrick.

Q. Did other lords follow their example?

A. Yes; several did so.

Q. What support did Bruce get, besides that of the Ulster chieftains?

A. Feidlim O'Connor, of Connaught, declared in his favor; but this help was soon cut off by the total defeat of Feidlim at the battle of Athenree.

Q. Who commanded the royalist army against Feidlim?

A. Sir Richard Bermingham.

Q. Was Edward Bruce dismayed by the defeat of his ally, O'Connor, at Athenree?

A. No; he ravaged the country up to the very walls of Dublin. He marched through Ossory, and advanced into Munster.

Q. Was he opposed in that province?

A. Yes; by Sir Roger Mortimer, the new lord deputy, who landed with a large force at Waterford. Bruce, fearing to meet this armament, hastily retreated northward.

Q. What was the condition of Bruce in the north?

A. It was miserable. His army could get no provisions, as the country had been previously wasted; and it is said that his soldiers, to allay the pangs of famine, used to eat the dead bodies of their brethren.

Q. Did Robert Bruce, the Scottish king, take any steps to relieve his brother Edward?

A. Yes; Robert prepared to bring an army to assist him.

Q. How did Edward Bruce act?

A. His impatience was his ruin. Instead of waiting for the arrival of help from Scotland, he led his shattered remnant of an army against Sir Richard Bermingham, who was at the head of 15,000 men. They fought at Dundalk, in 1318, and Bruce's army was utterly routed

Q. What was his own personal fate?

A. He engaged in single combat with an English knight, named Maupas or Malpas; and so fierce was the encounter, that both were slain.

Q. Did Robert Bruce arrive in Ireland?

A. Yes. But he immediately returned to Scotland on learning the fate of his unfortunate brother.

Q. How was Sir Richard Bermingham rewarded for his victory over Edward Bruce?

A. He was created earl of Louth and baron of Atherdee.

Q. Did the great lords of English descent settle into a peaceful mode of living?

A. Far from it. They were as quarrelsome as the original Irish chiefs. In 1327, we find the Butlers and Berminghams ranged on the side of Maurice of Desmond, in fierce civil war against De la Poer and the De Burgos.

Q. What was the cause of quarrel?

A. De la Poer had called Maurice of Desmond *a poet;* whereupon Maurice, in order to mark his indignation at the slander, very prosaically went to war with De la Poer.

Q. What use did the old Irish clans make of this circumstance?

A. They took up arms; and, under the guidance of O'Brian, prince of Thomond, defeated the English in several engagements, in Leinster.

Q. What particular grievance induced the Irish clans to take up arms just then?

A. They had renewed their earnest prayer to be admitted to the full privileges of British subjects; which privileges, by the influence of the lords of English descent, had been refused to them.

Q. Did the progress of time in any degree

tend to blend the two races of English and Irish into one nation?

A. To some extent it did so. In spite of bitter laws forbidding intermarriages, such unions did take place; and some of the lords even renounced the English name and English language, and adopted Irish names and used the Irish tongue.

Q. What was the description given of those who did so?

A. They were called "*Hibernicis ipsis Hiberniores.*"

Q. What does this phrase mean?

A. "More Irish than the Irish themselves."

Q. Did the Anglo-Irish lords often rebel against the king of England?

A. Yes; many of them did so.

Q. Who was appointed lord deputy of Ireland in 1361?

A. Lionel, Duke of Clarence; the second son of Edward the Third.

Q. What remarkable statute was passed during Lionel's vice-royalty?

A. The "statute of Kilkenny."

Q. In what year was it passed?

A. In 1367.

Q. What were its provisions?

A. It forbade, under pain of high treason, marriage, fosterage, or gossipred between persons of English descent and the old Irish families. It also forbade all persons of English descent to use the Irish language, or to adopt Irish names.

Q. What other provisions did this statute contain?

A. It strictly forbade the king's subjects in Ireland to entertain in their houses Irish minstrels,

musicians, or story-tellers. *It also forbade them to allow an Irish horse to graze upon their lands ! ! !*

Q. What was the consequence of this insane act ?

A. Fresh turmoils, riots, civil wars, and insurrections.

Q. How did it happen that the conquest of England, by the Normans, did not produce such evils to that country, as those which followed from the invasion of Ireland by the Anglo-Norman settlers ?

A. Because the Norman conquerors of England fixed the royal seat of government in England; and by the mere fact of residence, the government became in course of time identified in national feeling with that country. But in Ireland the government was not national in its sentiments or in its measures: instead of ruling Ireland for the good of its own people, it ruled the country for what it deemed the good of England; and it kept the two races in Ireland from uniting with each other for the common benefit, as the different races in England had done.

CHAPTER VII.

Reign of Edward the Third concluded.

Q. Did Edward find Ireland a profitable possession ?

A. No. It was a source of heavy expense to him.

Q. Did he ask the Irish for supplies of money ?

A. He did; but they replied that they had got none to give his majesty.

Q. What was Edward's next act?

A. He took a strange step. He summoned a sort of Irish parliament to meet him at Westminster; consisting of two members from each county, two burgesses from each city and borough, and two priests from each diocese.

Q. When this odd sort of parliament had met, how did Edward address them?

A. He complained of the expense of governing Ireland, and demanded money.

Q. What did the Irish deputies answer?

A. That their constituents had expressly prohibited them from granting his majesty any; on which the king dismissed them.

Q. Was the rest of his reign prosperous?

A. No. The barons, by their wars and exactions, rendered prosperity impossible.

Q. Were the contentious Irish chiefs and Anglo-Irish nobles worse than the same class of men in other lands?

A. No. In the days of the Heptarchy, we find that the petty kings of England were engaged in constant warfare. In later times, that country was ravaged by repeated civil wars. And in Scotland, we find that the quarrels of the Scottish nobles involved the kingdom in perpetual bloodshed for centuries.

Q. In what year did Edward the Third die?

A. In 1377.

CHAPTER VIII.

Reign of Richard the Second.

Q. Did King Richard the Second visit Ireland?

A. He did, in the hope of quelling the disturbances.

Q. How was he received on his arrival?

A. The Irish chiefs and the Anglo-Irish lords hastened to pay him their homage and allegiance. Richard made a royal progress through the kingdom, with great parade, and at profuse expense.

Q. What treaty did Richard make with Mac Murrough, prince of Leinster?

A. He stipulated that Mac Murrough and all his followers should quit Leinster by a certain day, having surrendered all their territories there to his majesty, his heirs and successors.

Q. What compensation did King Richard give Mac Murrough, for this vast surrender?

A. His majesty gave full license and encouragement to Mac Murrough to seize upon all such territories belonging to the Irish septs in any other part of the realm as he could grasp by violence. He also undertook to pay Mac Murrough an annual pension of eighty marks.

Q. Did Richard hold a parliament in Ireland?

A. He did — in 1395.

Q. What measures did he take whilst in the kingdom?

A. Wiser and more just ones than his extraordinary treaty with Mac Murrough could lead us to expect. He provided learned and upright judges for the courts of law; and he tried to conciliate the four chief Irish princes, by conferring

upon them the order of knighthood, and entertaining them at a banquet at his own table. It appears, from a letter which he wrote from Dublin to his English council, that he saw the advantages which might result from a milder mode of dealing with the ancient clans than had been used by any previous monarch.

Q. Whom did Richard appoint as lord lieutenant?

A. His kinsman, the young earl of March.

Q. Did March find the Irish obedient?

A. No; as soon as Richard quitted Ireland, several clans broke out in revolt.

Q. Did Mac Murrough evacuate Leinster according to his treaty?

A. No; and when required to do so, he took up arms against the lord lieutenant, who was slain in an engagement with the O'Byrnes and Kavanaghs.*

Q. When this news reached Richard, what steps did he take?

A. He proceeded once more to Ireland, in order to chastise Mac Murrough and the confederated clans.

Q. Did Richard succeed?

A. No; Mac Murrough was safe in his mountain fastnesses, and could not be brought to an open engagement. Richard's forces were unable to dislodge the clans from their rocky glens and dense forests; and as the country had been greatly wasted, provisions were almost unattainable; so that numbers of the English army perished from famine.

Q. What was Richard's next measure?

* Mac Murrough was chief of the Kavanaghs.

A. Finding himself obliged to retreat from his harassing enemy, he proposed to enter on a new treaty with Mac Murrough.

Q. How did Mac Murrough receive this proposal?

A. With scornful defiance.

Q. What then happened to Richard?

A. He was obliged to return to England to oppose Henry of Bolingbroke, Duke of Lancaster, who, during the king's absence from that country, had landed there to claim the crown. Richard was betrayed into the power of Lancaster, and thrown into prison, where he shortly afterwards died.

CHAPTER IX.

Reigns of Henry IV., V., and VI.

Q. What events occurred in Ireland in the reign of Henry the Fourth?

A. The Irish chiefs very much enlarged their power.

Q. Did the Irish lords of English descent become more *national* than they had previously been?

A. Yes; they began to feel that they were Irishmen. They, in fact, became Irish chieftains; and they intermarried frequently with the old Milesian families.

Q. Was there not a law forbidding such marriages?

A. Yes; but that law was now no longer observed.

Q. On what terms did the barons stand with the chiefs of native lineage?

A. Many of them paid to the chiefs a fixed tribute (equivalent to the Scotch *black-mail*), and received their protection in return.

Q. Did the English parliament look upon the Anglo-Irish families with enmity?

A. Yes; that parliament classed them together with the rest of the Irish people, in a statute whereby it forbade "all Irish adventurers whatsoever" to come into England; at the same time ordering all who had already come to depart thence without delay.

Q. Did this law extend to *all* the Irish, without any exception?

A. Yes. It even included the sons of the Irish nobility, who were then studying in the English inns of court and universities.

Q. What effect did this act of banishment produce on those who were the objects of it?

A. The Irish nobility and gentry, stung with the affront, returned home to their own country, and used all the means in their power to annoy the government.

Q. Were measures then changed?

A. Yes; the king (Henry the Sixth) appointed the earl of Ormond lord lieutenant of Ireland.

Q. Was that a politic appointment?

A. In some respects it was. He produced peace at first by his wise measures. But after some time he became embroiled with the earl of Desmond, who mustered sufficient force to give him battle, and after a tedious campaign, a truce was agreed to by both parties.

Q. Did Ormond long continue lord lieutenant?

A. No; his rivals had interest enough to prevail on the king to remove him; and Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury, was appointed in his place.

Q. Who succeeded Shrewsbury, in the year 1449?

A. Richard, duke of York.

Q. Was he a good viceroy?

A. One of the very best who ever ruled Ireland. He observed strict good faith in his treaties with the Irish chiefs; he felt for the wrongs of the peasantry, and tried to improve their condition.

Q. What circumstance called the duke of York from Ireland?

A. He went to England in order to defend himself against a false charge that had been made; namely, that he had encouraged the rebellion of a man named Jack Cade and his party.

Q. What occurred in England?

A. There was a rebellion against Henry the Sixth, who was thrown into prison, and the royal power was transferred to the duke of York.

Q. How long did the duke retain it?

A. Not long. Queen Margaret assembled the friends of her imprisoned husband, and gained a victory over the Yorkists, at Blore Heath.

Q. What was the duke's next step?

A. He fled for safety to Ireland.

Q. How was he received there?

A. With the greatest joy. The Irish parliament passed an act attaching the guilt of high treason to any attempt that should be made to molest or disturb the duke or his followers, under pretext of writs from England; for the English parliament had previously attainted him.

Q. Was the Irish act for his protection violated?

A. It was; by a follower of the earl of Ormond. The delinquent was forthwith executed.

Q. What was the duke's ultimate fate?

A. He returned to England, with a numerous following of his Irish adherents, to strike a blow for the crown; but was slain, and his army routed by superior numbers, at the battle of Wakefield.

Q. What declaration did the Irish parliament make in the 38th year of the reign of King Henry the Sixth?

A. The Irish parliament in that year declared its own independence on England.

Q. In what terms?

A. The two houses declared that "Ireland is, *and always has been*, incorporated within itself by ancient laws and customs; and is *only* to be governed by such laws as by the lords and commons of the land, in parliament assembled, have been advised, accepted, affirmed and proclaimed." They also declared, "that by custom, privilege, and franchise, there has ever been a royal seal peculiar to Ireland, to which *alone* the king's subjects are to pay obedience."

Q. What was the final result of the civil war in England?

A. Notwithstanding the exertions of Queen Margaret, her husband's power was utterly destroyed; and the throne was usurped by Edward, (of York,) fourth king of that name, in the year 1461.

CHAPTER X.

Reigns of Edward IV. and V., and Richard III.

Q. What was the condition of Ireland in the reign of Edward the Fourth?

A. At that time the Irish people — thereby meaning not only the Milesian clans, but also the descendants of the Norman invaders who had become thoroughly Irish in their language, names, manners, and sentiments — were so strong, as compared with the small English colony of occupation, that they could with the utmost ease have acquired for themselves the supreme government of the kingdom.

Q. And what prevented them from doing so?

A. Their old sin of mutual discord, mutual enmity, mutual distrust. They would not combine with each other for a common and general purpose.

Q. Had many of the Anglo-Norman families then adopted the Irish name and nation?

A. Yes; very many. And to them, as also to the Irish chiefs inhabiting the borders of the English pale, or district, did the English inhabitants continue, in this reign, to pay the black-mail, or tribute, for protection from the lawless violence of freebooters.

Q. How did the English government at this time use such influence as it possessed?

A. Its influence was used, as was generally the case, to insult and oppress the Irish people; which it could not have done if it were not for the weakness arising from the divisions of the people themselves.

Q. What oppressive measures were enacted?

A. In the year 1463, a parliament held at Trim by Fitz-Eustace, lord Portlester, made a law, "that any body may kill thieves or robbers, *or any person going to rob or steal*, having no faithful men of good name and in the English dress in their company."

Q. What were the results of this law?

A. It gave a great facility to the English inhabitants to murder their Irish neighbors; since it was sufficient justification for the crime to allege "that the deceased had been *going* to rob or steal."

Q. What other enactment was made by that parliament?

A. It enacted, on pain of forfeiture of goods, that all the Irish who inhabited the English district should take English names, wear the English dress, and swear allegiance.

Q. What other act was passed against the people in this reign?

A. In a parliament over which the English bishop of Meath, William Sherwood, presided, it was enacted that any Englishman, injured by any Irishman beyond the pale, might avenge himself on the entire clan to which the aggressor belonged.

Q. What circumstances prevented all the inhabitants of Ireland from making common cause with each other, and blending together in one great national mass?

A. We have seen already that the unhappy disposition of the people to quarrel among themselves fatally weakened them. But there was another cause.

Q. What was that?

A. The nature of the government, which was almost always opposed to the people, and regarded them not as friends and subjects, but as enemies. This adverse power was sustained, not only by the mutual jealousies which it fomented amongst the people, but also by fresh streams of English adventurers, who continually poured into the country, bringing with them a perpetual supply of bitter hatred to the natives.

Q. What lesson do we learn from this?

A. That we,—the Irish people,—must cast aside all jealousies of every sort whatsoever, of *race*, of *creed*, and of *party;* and stand firmly (but peaceably) together: otherwise we can never obtain for our country the first of all political blessings — self-government.

Q. Does not the conquest* of Ireland by the Anglo-Normans destroy the right of the Irish people to a resident Irish parliament?

A. No more than the conquest of England by the Normans destroyed the right of the English people to a resident English parliament. Our right is as ancient as theirs, and we never, by any act of ours, surrendered it.

Q. What was the fate, in this reign, of the earl of Ormond?

A. King Edward beheaded him for having favored the late monarch, Henry the Sixth.

Q. Did the old clan-feud between the Butlers and Geraldines still continue?

A. Yes; and the former were freshly exasper-

* I do not use the word "conquest" in its military meaning, in which sense it certainly cannot be applied to the proceedings of Strongbow and Henry the Second, in Ireland. I merely use the phrase as expressive of the fact, that the anti-national party got the upper hand in Ireland.

ated by the attainder and execution of the earl, their chieftain.

Q. What were, at this time, the war-cries of the several clans?

A. "Croom-aboo!" was the war-shout of the Geraldines; literally meaning "Hurrah for Croom!" from the castle of that name in the county Limerick belonging to the earl of Kildare. In like manner, "Butler-aboo!" was the war-cry of the followers of Ormond; "Shannat-aboo!" was that of the Geraldines of Desmond, from the castle of Shannat, where their chief, the great earl, held a rude court.

Q. What was the war-cry of the O'Brians of Thomond?

A. "Lamh-laider-aboo!"—or "Hurrah for the strong hand!"

Q. That of the O'Neills?

A. "Lamh-dhearg-aboo!"—or "Hurrah for the red (or bloody) hand!" The Fitzpatricks of Ossory adopted, as their war-cry, "Gear-laider-aboo!"—or, "Hurrah for the sharp and strong!" And the gathering-shouts of all the clans contained similar allusions, either to the castles of their residence, or to some quality on which they prided themselves.

Q. Of what description were the native Irish soldiery of that period?

A. The cavalry of the chiefs and barons were mounted on small, but very strong and active horses. These horses were called "hobbies," and their riders "hobellers." From all ancient accounts it appears that the Irish were eminently skilful as horsemen; and active and dexterous in the use of their weapons on horseback.

Q. What were their weapons?

A. Short spears and sabres; also battle-axes. They had scarcely any armor.

Q. Describe the foot-soldiers, or infantry.

A. Of these there were two sorts; a heavily armed infantry, called "galloglasses;" accoutered with iron head-pieces, efficient coats of armor, and bearing a broad axe and sword.

Q. How were the light infantry accoutred?

A. They wore little or no armor save the iron head-piece; they bore a long spear or javelin, and a long knife called a *skian.*

Q. Did the quarrel of the Butlers and Geraldines disturb this entire reign?

A. Yes; their unhappy contentions were protracted, with varying fortune; the Butlers sometimes gaining the advantage, and the Geraldines again recovering the mastery. In reward of Desmond's service in defeating the Butlers of Wexford, Edward made Desmond lord deputy of Ireland.

Q. What was his first act as lord deputy?

A. He made war upon the Irish septs in Meath.

Q. Did he defeat them?

A. No; they took him prisoner. He was, however, soon set free by his friend O'Connor of O'Fally.

Q. What was his next act?

A. He made war on O'Brian of Thomond.

Q. With what success?

A. O'Brian gained a rapid advantage over the lord deputy, who bought him off by engaging that he should be paid a regular tribute.

Q. Was Desmond removed from the government for these failures?

A. No; the king continued him in the viceroyalty; until at last the queen became his enemy.

Q. How did he offend the queen?*

A. By speaking incautiously of the meanness of her birth.

Q. What steps were *then* taken to destroy him?

A. He was removed from his office; supplanted by lord deputy Tiptoft; attainted by parliament on several charges, and executed without a trial.

Q. Meanwhile, how did the Butlers conduct themselves?

A. John of Ormond, the late earl's eldest living brother, contrived to obtain the favor of the king.

Q. What benefit did the Butler family derive from the royal favor?

A. An act of parliament was obtained, repealing the former act of attainder and forfeiture, and restoring the old honors and estates to the heir of Ormond.

Q. How long did the Butlers continue uppermost?

A. Not very long; we find the earl of Kildare made lord deputy in 1478.

Q. Did not the king desire to remove Kildare, and appoint Lord Grey to that office?

A. He did; but Kildare held the office in defiance of the king; and so strongly was he supported, that the viceroy appointed by the king was obliged to quit Ireland.

Q. What Milesian alliance did the earl of Kildare make?

A. He gave his daughter in marriage to the son of the chief of the O'Neills.

* Elizabeth Grey.

Q. What use did Kildare make of the influence he gained by this connection?

A. He used his influence to preserve Ireland in peace during the short, feeble reign of Edward the Fifth, and the short reign of Richard the Third.

Q. In what year did Richard the Third die?

A. He was slain at the battle of Bosworth, in 1485.

CHAPTER XI.

The Reign of Henry VII.

Q. When Henry the Seventh ascended the throne, whom did he appoint lord lieutenant of Ireland?

A. He continued the earl of Kildare in that office.

Q. What remarkable event occurred in Ireland in 1486?

A. A low impostor, named Simnel, arrived in Dublin, accompanied by one Richard Simons, an Oxford priest, who had trained him to personate the earl of Warwick.

Q. Who was the earl of Warwick?

A. Son of the late duke of Clarence, and grandson of the duke of York who had been viceroy of Ireland.

Q. Where was the earl of Warwick at that time?

A. In the prison of the Tower of London.

Q. Why did the king detain him there?

A. From his jealous fears lest Warwick, who

was heir to the house of York, should lay claim to the throne.

Q. How was the impostor, Simnel, received in Ireland?

A. His tale was believed. He was received by Kildare, and many other leading Irishmen, as their lawful king; and, as such, he was crowned in Dublin, under the title of Edward the Sixth.

Q. What then became of him?

A. He went to England to give battle to Henry the Seventh; was defeated and made prisoner, and employed by the king as a scullion in the royal kitchen.

Q. How did the Irish lords and chiefs employ themselves?

A. In petty wars.

Q. Mention some of them.

A. The Geraldines of Desmond defeated the M'Carthys and O'Carrols, and obtained large tracts of their lands. The lord lieutenant's brother-in-law, O'Neill, went to war with the chief of Tyrconnell.

Q. What was their quarrel about?

A. Tribute. O'Neill had written to Tyrconnell, "Send me tribute; or else——" To this Tyrconnell answered, "I owe you none; and if——"

Q. What was the result of the war that followed?

A. The clan of the O'Neills were defeated.

Q. Who was Perkin Warbeck?

A. He was an impostor, calling himself duke of York, the second son of Edward the Fourth.

Q. When did he land in Ireland?

A. He landed at Cork in 1492.

Q. Did he raise any faction in Ireland?

A. Nowhere except among the citizens of Cork.

Q. How long did he remain in Ireland?

A. Only for a few weeks, at the end of which he departed to France.

Q. Who was lord lieutenant in 1494?

A. Sir Edward Poynings.

Q. What was enacted by the remarkable law called "Poynings's Act?"

A. It enacted that, prior to the holding of any parliament in Ireland, the lord lieutenant and privy council should first certify to the king the causes of assembling such parliament; specifying also such acts as they deemed it requisite to pass.

Q. Was this law an infraction of the rights of the king's Irish subjects?

A. Yes; a very grievous one.

Q. But did the Irish thereby, in any degree, forfeit their full inherent right to self-legislation?

A. By no means; any more than the English nation would forfeit *their* right to self-government by any servile surrender of power on the part of their parliament.

Q. What is the duty of the people in regard to all such unjust laws?

A. To obey them so long as they are laws; but to struggle in every legal, peaceful mode to get them repealed.

Q. Did Perkin Warbeck land again in Ireland?

A. He did; but being defeated at Waterford, he fled to Scotland.

Q. Did the Butlers, at this time, try to ruin the earl of Kildare?

A. Yes; they had got him attainted by Poy-

nings's parliament, and he now was obliged to meet his accuser in the king's presence.

Q. In what year was that?

A. In the year 1496.

Q. When the parties were met, what did the king say to Kildare?

A. He advised him to procure for himself the help of able counsel.

Q. What was Kildare's answer?

A. "I choose the best counsel in the realm," said he, seizing the king's hand. "I take your majesty to be my counsel against these false knaves."

Q. Did the king resent this freedom?

A. No; he looked on it as a proof that Kildare was honest.

Q. What was alleged against Kildare?

A. High treason was alleged against him, but he easily cleared himself.

Q. Was any other charge made?

A. Yes; he was accused of burning the church of Cashel.

Q. What was his defence?

A. "It is true," said he, "that I burned the church. But I did so because I thought the archbishop was in it.

Q. What effect did this defence produce?

A. The oddity of it convulsed the king and all present with laughter.

Q. What did Kildare's accusers then say?

A. "All Ireland," said they, "cannot govern this earl."

Q. What was the king's answer?

A. "Then this earl shall govern all Ireland;" whereupon he immediately made Kildare lord lieutenant of the kingdom.

Q. How did Kildare discharge the duties of that office?

A. As soon as he was taken into the king's confidence, he went to war against his own fellow-countrymen.

Q. Where — and on what account?

A. He brought the king's troops against his son-in-law, Ulick De Burgo, in Connaught, to punish that chief for maltreating his wife, who was Kildare's daughter.

Q. What clans assisted De Burgo?

A. The O'Brians, and other tribes from Munster.

Q. Who were Kildare's confederates?

A. All the Geraldines, many lords of the pale, and his ally and relative O'Neill, with a numerous following.

Q. Where was the quarrel decided?

A. At the battle of Knocktow, near Galway.

Q. Who gained the victory?

A. Kildare.

Q. What remarkable proof of the ancient English hatred of Irishmen did Lord Gormanstown then give?

A. After the battle, he said to Kildare, "We have beaten our enemies; but in order to finish the good work, we ought now to cut the throats of the Irish who have helped us to do so."

Q. Was this advice acted on?

A. No; it would have been inconvenient, for it would have weakened the conquering party very much.

Q. Was there any other reason for not acting on it?

A. Yes; the bad feeling expressed by Lord Gormanstown was not then very general: it had

been softened away by many intermarriages between the ancient Irish clans and the Anglo-Irish families.

Q. Are there any Lord Gormanstowns in Ireland at the present day?

A. Unluckily there are; there are many unnatural Irishmen who hate their native land, and are ever ready to help the English government to oppress and spoliate their own fellow-countrymen.

Q. What is the reason of this?

A. Because the power that rules Ireland is an English, not an Irish power; and so long as the ruling power is unfriendly, so long will every base, bad spirit in the land adopt that unfriendliness, in order to pay its court to the ruling influence.

Q. In what year did Henry the Seventh die?

A. In 1509.

CHAPTER XII.

The Reign of Henry VIII.

Q. Did King Henry the Eighth continue Kildare as lord deputy?

A. Yes; until Kildare happened to incur the jealousy of Cardinal Wolsey, on which that prelate procured his removal.

Q. Who was appointed in his place?

A. The earl of Surrey.

Q. What events took place in this reign?

A. Ormond had invaded the territory of Ossory, and plundered Mac Gilla Patrick, or Fitz-Patrick, the prince of it.

Q. What steps did Fitz-Patrick take?

A. He sent an envoy to the king to state his complaints.

Q. Did the king interfere in the case?

A. No; Ormond was allowed to ravage Ossory with impunity.

Q. What, at last, checked him?

A. The power of Kildare, who contrived to make his peace with the king, and was reappointed lord deputy.

Q. Meanwhile, how was the earl of Desmond acting?

A. He assumed the dignity and privileges of a sovereign prince.

Q. In what manner?

A. He claimed a right to absent himself from parliament; and also of being never obliged to enter a fortified town.

Q. What use was made of these claims to sovereignty?

A. Francis, king of France, learning Desmond's pretensions, endeavored to raise a domestic commotion in Ireland through his agency, for the purpose of embarrassing England.

Q. How did Desmond receive the French king's proposals?

A. His vanity was flattered at being treated as a sovereign prince by so powerful a monarch, and he entered into an alliance with Francis.

Q. What were the results?

A. Before the treaty could be acted upon, Francis was taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia.

Q. And what became of Desmond?

A. The king determined to punish him, and sent orders to Kildare to that effect.

Q. Did Kildare execute the orders?

A. No; he did not like to be made the agent

of his kinsman's punishment; and taking advan tage of some riots in Ulster, he marched into that province under pretext of suppressing them.

Q. Did the king resent Kildare's disobedience?

A. Yes; he required him to proceed to London to account for his conduct.

Q. What arrangements did Kildare make?

A. He supplied all his own castles with arms and ammunition from the king's stores. He committed the government to his son Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, who was only twenty years of age; and he then proceeded to London.

Q. How was he treated on arriving in London?

A. He was imprisoned in the Tower.

Q. How did his son, Lord Thomas, act in Ireland?

A. Having been excited by a false report of his father's execution, Lord Thomas rushed into the privy-council chamber in Dublin, followed by one hundred and forty armed retainers, and there renounced his allegiance to King Henry.

Q. What was Lord Thomas's next step?

A. He quitted the astonished council, and proceeded to wage war on the garrison of Dublin.

Q. With what success?

A. He was, at first, easily defeated, from the fewness of his supporters; but retiring from Dublin, and joining the O'Connors and O'Neills, he speedily increased his power.

Q. What steps were taken against him?

A. The new lord lieutenant, Sir William Skeffington, besieged the castle of Maynooth, the best stronghold of the Fitzgeralds.

Q. Did the castle make a gallant defence?

A. Yes; it held out for fourteen days; and Skeffington was about to retire from before it,

when it was placed in his power by the treachery (as is alleged) of the foster-brother of Lord Thomas.

Q. How did Skeffington reward the traitor?

A. He paid him the stipulated price of his treachery, and then had him hanged.

Q. What effect did the taking of Maynooth produce on Lord Thomas's fortunes?

A. Many of his followers, dispirited at the news, dispersed; but with those who still remained, he made himself so formidable in an irregular warfare among the defiles and woods, that Lord Grey, the English commander, solemnly promised him protection if he should surrender himself.

Q. Did Lord Thomas confide in the Englishman's promise?

A. He did, and gave himself up.

Q. How did Lord Grey then treat him?

A. He sent him prisoner to England.

Q. How else did he treat the Fitzgeralds?

A. He invited five uncles of Lord Thomas to a feast; in the midst of which he treacherously seized them, and sent them in custody to England.

Q. What was Henry's conduct to these five unoffending men?

A. He had them all hanged at Tyburn, together with the unfortunate Lord Thomas.

Q. What great event took place in this reign?

A. The king rejected the pope's supremacy over the church, and set up his own supremacy in place of it.

Q. Did many of the Irish people abandon the Catholic, and embrace the Protestant, religion?

A. Scarcely any; the great bulk of the people adhered to the old Catholic faith; some few

persons in connection with the government adopted the new religion.

Q. What were the effects of this change of religion on the country?

A. It gave some new pretexts to the English disposition to spoliate and persecute Ireland. But in truth England, whether Catholic or Protestant, had, at all times since their connection, treated Ireland with treachery and cruelty.

Q. How did the government dispose of the property that had belonged to the Catholic church?

A. They transferred the tithes to the Protestant clergy, and the greater portion of the abbey lands to powerful laymen; thus throwing on the Catholic people of Ireland the support of *two* churches: their own, and the new one.

Q. What was the fate of Lord Deputy Grey?

A. Some charges having been made against him, he was convicted, and hanged at Tyburn by the orders of Henry.

Q. In what year did Henry die?

A. In 1537.

CHAPTER XIII.

Reigns of Edward VI. and Mary I.

Q. What was the first exploit of the new king's government in Ireland?

A. Some disturbances having been excited in Leix and Offalley, the English government induced the chiefs of those districts, O'Moore and O'Connor, to proceed to England; promising that Edward would show them favor similar to that

which his father had shown to O'Neill in like circumstances.

Q. Did the chiefs confide in this promise?

A. Yes; and they accordingly repaired to London.

Q. Did the English government perform their promises?

A. No; O'Moore and O'Connor were thrown into prison, and their lands were seized and given to English adventurers.

Q. What became of those chiefs?

A. O'Moore soon died in prison; O'Connor lingered out some weary years in his confinement.

Q. What was the next measure of the government?

A. They tried to propagate the Reformation in Ireland.

Q. How did they begin?

A. Saint Leger was sent as lord deputy to Ireland for that purpose.

Q. What means were used under his auspices?

A. In Athlone a band of soldiers proceeded from the garrison to ravage the old church of Clonmacnoise. Similar acts of riot and outrage were committed in various other ecclesiastical buildings throughout the kingdom.

Q. In what year did Edward the Sixth die?

A. In 1553.

Q. Who succeeded him?

A. His sister, Mary Tudor.

Q. Did she favor the Reformation?

A. No; in England she cruelly persecuted its professors, and caused numbers to be burned to death for their belief.

Q. How did the Irish Catholics act, when

their old religion was restored to its ancient power and possessions in this reign?

A. They acted with the utmost forbearance. They did not injure a single person in the slightest particular for professing a creed that differed from their own; and when the blood-thirsty queen was persecuting the Protestants in England, the Catholic corporation of Dublin opened 74 houses in Dublin at their own expense, to receive and shelter the Protestants who sought refuge in Ireland from the fury of the English government.

Q. What do you think of such conduct?

A. That it was a glorious proof of Irish tolerance and charity; and fully demonstrated the fitness of the Irish Catholics for religious freedom.

Q. Did the clans of Leix and Offalley, who had been deprived of their lands in the reign of Edward, appeal to Queen Mary to restore them?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the answer given by the government?

A. They sent a strong military force to extirpate the inhabitants from the soil of their forefathers; and the troops committed the most horrible barbarities, which ended in a general massacre of the people.

Q. Were any saved?

A. Yes; a small remnant, whom the earls of Ossory and Kildare exerted themselves to protect.

Q. What were the districts thenceforth called?

A. "King's County," and "Queen's County;" and their principal towns were named "Philipstown," and "Maryborough," in honor of the sovereign and her husband.

Q. In what year did Queen Mary die?

A. In 1558.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Reign of Queen Elizabeth.

Q. In what state was Ireland at the time of Queen Elizabeth's accession?

A. In a state of universal disturbance.

Q. What cause disturbed Connaught?

A. The two great branches of the house of De Burgo were struggling with each other for the mastery.

Q. What circumstances agitated Leinster?

A. The remnant that had escaped from the massacre in Leix and Offalley roamed over that entire province in small parties, marauding wherever they could, to indemnify themselves for their losses and sufferings.

Q. What contentions existed in Munster?

A. The chieftaincy of the northern division of the province was warmly contested between the earl of Thomond and Daniel O'Bryan. The Butlers and Geraldines were also at war with each other.

Q. In what condition was Ulster?

A. John O'Neill was speedily acquiring the dominion of the whole of Ulster.

Q. Whom did Elizabeth appoint as lord lieutenant?

A. The earl of Sussex; who, on departing for England, entrusted his government to the hands of Sir Henry Sidney.

Q. Did Sidney call upon O'Neill to account for his proceedings?

A. Yes; he invited him to the English camp for the purpose of a conference.

Q. Did O'Neill accept the invitation?

A. No; he remembered how O'Moore and O'Connor had been entrapped, and he wisely declined.

Q. What, then, was his answer to Sidney?

A. He excused himself by saying he was engaged in having his child christened with due pomp; and he invited Sidney to attend the ceremony as the infant's godfather.

Q. Did Sidney comply?

A. He did; and he was much surprised at the courtly magnificence with which the Irish chieftain entertained him.

Q. How did they arrange the dispute between O'Neill and the government?

A. O'Neill, by the statement of his wrongs, made a very favorable impression upon Sidney, who advised him to rely for full justice on Elizabeth's sense of honor and of right.

Q. Did O'Neill agree to leave matters to the queen's decision?

A. He did; and he and Sidney parted from each other on terms of friendship.

Q. Did Sussex soon return from England?

A. Yes; and, according to Elizabeth's instructions, he immediately set about procuring laws to be passed for the establishment of the new English religion; which, during the reign of Mary, had been deprived of the tithes and other state endowments.

Q. What acts were passed for this purpose?

A. The appointment of bishops was vested in the sovereign; and heavy penalties were inflicted upon all who would not attend the new worship.

Q. How were the priesthood treated?

A. They were expelled from their cures by

the civil power; and Protestant clergymen, who had come in large numbers from England, were put into their places.

Q. What were O'Neill's measures all this while?

A. He set out to London, attended by a band of galloglasses, whose appearance at the court of Elizabeth excited great curiosity.

Q. How did Elizabeth receive him?

A. With the most flattering courtesy and favor. She promised to support his claims to the best of her power.

Q. Did Elizabeth keep this promise?

A. It is probable that at the time she intended to keep it; but, notwithstanding the manifest loyalty of his *conduct*, she listened to his enemies who impeached his *intentions;* and they, encouraged by an expression which she used, proceeded to effect his ruin.

Q. What was that expression?

A. "If O'Neill rebels," said the queen, "it will be all the better for my servants, for there will be estates enough for them who lack." On which, Elizabeth's Irish government determined to goad O'Neill into rebellion.

Q. How did they begin?

A. Sir Henry Sidney, who was now lord deputy, established a garrison of English troops at Derry.

Q. What right had O'Neill to complain of that?

A. It was a needless insult to him. The country being perfectly tranquil at the time, no troops were required to check disturbance; and the planting a garrison in the midst of O'Neill's country showed a want of reliance on the good faith

of the promises he had made to the queen's government.

Q. What did O'Neill resolve to do?

A. He resolved to get rid of the English garrison.

Q. How did he manage to do so?

A. He contrived to make them begin hostilities, and then sent to the lord deputy a bitter complaint of their conduct; at the same time proposing a conference at Dundalk, to adjust all differences.

Q. Did the conference take place?

A. No; before it could possibly be held, the powder magazine at Derry was accidentally blown up, and the English garrison were obliged to quit the town.

Q. Did O'Neill then carry on the war against the government?

A. He did, but ineffectually, as he found himself deserted by the chiefs on whose support he had relied with confidence.

Q. Was their defection owing to English intrigue?

A. Yes; O'Neill found, to his cost, that the English garrison at Derry had been busily engaged in sowing the seeds of disaffection to him, from the first moment of their settlement.

Q. What was his fate?

A. He perished by the treachery of Piers, an English officer, who induced the Scotch commandant of a garrison stationed at Clan-hu-boy, to take advantage of a preconcerted quarrel at a banquet, to massacre O'Neill and his followers.

Q. What reward did Piers receive for his treachery?

A. He received the sum of one thousand marks

from the government, on sending the head of O'Neill to the lord deputy.

Q. What became of O'Neill's estates?

A. They were divided amongst the managers of the queen's Irish government.

Q. Who was the next great Irish lord on whose destruction the government were resolved?

A. The earl of Desmond.

Q. How was this managed?

A. In a quarrel between Desmond and Ormond about the boundaries of their estates, Lord Deputy Sidney, to whom the dispute had been referred, decided at first in favor of Desmond; but, on receiving the queen's orders to reëxamine the case, Sidney not only decided this second time in favor of Ormond, but loaded Desmond with all the expenses his rival had incurred.

Q. Did Desmond obey this new decision?

A. No, for he felt it was grossly unjust.

Q. How was he then treated?

A. He was seized by the lord deputy, and, after some delay, sent as a prisoner to the Tower of London, where he was kept in captivity for many years.

Q. What disturbances followed?

A. Many serious ones; Munster and Ulster became embroiled; the former, with the claims of the earl of Clancarthy to the princedom of the province; the latter, with the struggles of Turlough O'Neill to augment his authority.

Q. What efforts did the Geraldines of Desmond make to avenge the imprisonment of the earl, their chief?

A. They are said to have negotiated with their old foes, the followers of Ormond, to effect a general insurrection.

Q. What steps were taken, meanwhile, by the government?

A. They ordered Sir Peter Carew to lead his army against the Butlers. He accordingly entered their country; and meeting an unarmed concourse of people, who gazed with curiosity at his forces, he commanded a general massacre, and about four hundred defenceless, unresisting people were put to death.

Q. Was massacre a familiar instrument of English government in those days?

A. Yes; massacres of the Irish people, by the agents of English power in this country, were frequent.

Q. What were Elizabeth's plans with regard to Ulster?

A. She intended to despoil the old proprietors of their inheritance, and to plant the province with English colonies.

Q. Who was the chief Englishman that visited Ireland to execute this scheme?

A. Walter, earl of Essex.

Q. What was his character?

A. Treacherous and sanguinary; he did not hesitate to commit any crime which he thought might weaken the Irish.

Q. State an instance.

A. He invited a chieftain of the race of O'Neill to a banquet, under the semblance of friendship, and then took the opportunity to murder his unsuspicious guest.

Q. Did the scheme of planting Ulster with English colonies succeed?

A. Not to any considerable extent until the next reign.

Q. What remarkable incident occurred in 1578?

A. Fitzmaurice, one of the Geraldines of Desmond, who had been treated with severity by the government, sought for foreign assistance against English power in several of the continental states.

Q. Did he succeed?

A. He met no support from foreign sovereigns; but he mustered a small band of about fourscore Spaniards, whom he headed in an invasion of Ireland.

Q. Did the little armament land in Ireland?

A. Yes; upon the coast of Kerry.

Q. What then happened?

A. Their ships were immediately seized by an English vessel of war.

Q. What was the fate of this enterprise?

A. It was unsuccessful.

Q. Was their insurrection sanctioned by the earl of Desmond?

A. No; he had been released from the prison into which he had unjustly been thrown, and carefully avoided any step by which he might again incur the wrath of the government.

Q. Did this prudence avail to protect him?

A. No; for the government were resolved to destroy him.

Q. What was his offence?

A. The greatness of his estates; which the friends of the government were resolved to seize and divide amongst themselves.

Q. In what manner was the war against Desmond carried on by the government?

A. With the utmost ferocity and cruelty. It was, in truth, a succession of massacres committed on the people of that territory, diversified with

the destruction of their houses and the wasting of their substance.

Q. Did any succors arrive to Desmond?

A. Yes; a Spanish force of 700 men landed at Golden Fort, on the coast of Kerry.

Q. What was their fate?

A. They were blockaded in the fort, and then massacred in cold blood by the orders of Sir Walter Raleigh. Among the apologists of this massacre, is the English poet, Spenser.

Q. What was the conduct of Admiral Winter?

A. He received into his fleet some miserable fugitives who sought refuge from the persecution.

Q. Was the humane admiral censured for this conduct?

A. He was, by the ferocious party who supported the government, and who thirsted for the extirpation of the people.

Q. What was the conduct of Desmond, surrounded as he now was by enemies?

A. He made a gallant battle to the last, and in one of his sallies took the town of Youghal.

Q. What finally was his fate?

A. His forces were overwhelmed by numbers; and he himself was murdered by a traitor named Kelly, who discovered the aged earl in a hut, in which he had sought safety and concealment.

Q. What was done with his head?

A. It was sent by Ormond to the queen; and by her orders exposed on a stake at London Bridge.

Q. Who was lord lieutenant of Ireland in 1584?

A. Sir John Perrot.

Q. What sort of parliament assembled in that year?

A. A thoroughly national one, in which the descendants of the aboriginal Irish clans sat side by side with the members of the Anglo-Norman families.

Q. Did that parliament reject the measures of the court?

A. Yes; they refused the supplies, and rejected several bills which had been introduced by the influence of the English privy-council.

Q. What made them so refractory?

A. The horror they felt at the crimes committed by the government in the war against Desmond, who had been driven into insurrection by the arts of his enemies.

CHAPTER XV.

The Reign of Elizabeth continued.

Q. Who was Hugh O'Neill?

A. Nephew of the late earl of Tyrone.

Q. What requests did he make of the government?

A. He petitioned for leave to take his seat in the house of lords, as earl of Tyrone; and he also prayed that his estates might be restored to him.

Q. What was his claim upon the English government?

A. His uniform loyalty to the crown.

Q. Were his petitions granted by Elizabeth?

A. Yes.

Q. Did he long continue in the quiet enjoyment of his territories?

A. No; the managers at Dublin Castle were

resolved that his extensive estates should be divided amongst English adventurers; and, with a view to effect his ruin, no means were left untried to drive him to rebel.

Q. Meanwhile, what crimes did the new lord lieutenant, Sir William Fitz-William commit in Ulster?

A. He marched into Monaghan, seized on the chief of the Mac Mahons, had him tried and convicted, on a false charge of high treason, by a jury of common soldiers, by whom the hapless chief was murdered on the spot.

Q. What was the signal for open war against O'Neill?

A. He had been driven, by a variety of oppressions and petty hostilities, to attack the English garrison at Blackwater; whereupon a force of 2000 men, under the command of Sir John Norris, was sent to oppose him.

Q. Was the war against O'Neill at once successful?

A. Far from it. O'Neill renewed his attack upon the fort of Blackwater, of which, after a hot contest, he obtained the possession — as well as of the town of Armagh, which the English garrison evacuated without a struggle.

Q. What was the loss upon the English side at Blackwater?

A. The English lost 1500 men, including many officers. The Irish obtained thirty-four standards, besides the entire arms, artillery, and ammunition of their enemies.

Q. Was the English army totally destroyed?

A. No; there was a remnant of it saved.

Q. Through whose agency?

A. Through the valor of an Irish chief named

O'Reilly, who had joined the royal cause against O'Neill. O'Reilly, at the head of his clan, covered the retreat of the survivors of the English.

Q. How did O'Neill then occupy himself?

A. In combining together as many of his countrymen as he possibly could, for the purpose of resisting England. He also sent ambassadors to Spain, to solicit the aid of king Philip.

Q. What measures did Elizabeth take?

A. She sent an army of 20,000 men to Ireland, under the command of Robert, earl of Essex.

Q. Did Essex crush O'Neill?

A. No; he marched to the south, to quell the insurrection, which had spread into Munster.

Q. What was the policy of the Irish?

A. They avoided a general engagement, but frequently defeated detached parties of the English army.

Q. What was the most memorable of those triumphs?

A. A victory won by the O'Moore's, of Leix, over a large body of Essex's cavalry. From the great number of feathers lost by the English troops in that engagement, the Irish called the place the "Pass of Plumes."

Q. Was there any other noted conflict in Leinster?

A. Yes; the O'Byrnes overthrew another detachment of Essex's army, although the advantage in numbers was on the English side.

Q. How did Elizabeth receive the news of these reverses?

A. She was enraged against Essex, and ordered him to march to the north.

Q. What was the fate of Sir Conyers Clifford?

A. While leading an army northward, to the

aid of Lord Essex, Sir Conyers fell into an ambuscade prepared for him by the chief of the O'Ruarc's, and was slain.

Q. How did the campaign of Essex end?

A. In an amicable conference which he held with O'Neill, upon a rising ground within view of both their armies.

Q. What was the immediate result of that conference?

A. A truce for six weeks; during which Essex went to England, and the command of the English army was entrusted to Sir George Carew, president of Munster, and Blount, Lord Mountjoy.

Q. How did these leaders conduct the war?

A. With great barbarity; especially Carew, whose natural disposition was cruel and ferocious. He ordered his troops to destroy the crops growing in the fields, so that the wasting influence of famine came in aid of the English arms. He burned the houses in O'Neill's country, and massacred their inhabitants.

Q. Did he seek to draw the people to allegiance to the queen?

A. No; and wherever an offer of allegiance was made by any of O'Neill's partisans, Carew would only accept it on the condition, that the party making the offer should first prove his title to admission by murdering one of his former confederates!

Q. Did O'Neill receive help from Spain?

A. Two thousand Spaniards, under the command of Don Juan D'Aquila, landed in the extreme south of the kingdom.

Q. Were these Spanish auxiliaries of the slightest use to O'Neill?

A. No; they were rather an incumbrance. He

was obliged to march an army to their relief from the opposite end of the kingdom; a task of difficulty and danger.

Q. What was the issue of the struggle?

A. O'Neill, urged by the foolish impatience of the Spanish commander, risked a premature attack upon Mountjoy; which, however, might have been successful, if his plans had not been betrayed by spies to the English general.

Q. Was Mountjoy victorious?

A. Yes; notwithstanding the valiant exertions of O'Neill to recover the day. The Spaniards returned to their own country, O'Neill to Ulster; and the slaughter of those who were unable to secure their safety by flight was most horrible and merciless.

Q. Whither did the Irish lords who had been in arms against the queen direct their course?

A. To Spain, where many of their posterity are to be found at this day.

Q. What was the ultimate fate of O'Neill?

A. The government still carried on the war against him in the north. The provisions of his followers had been destroyed by the English troops; whilst his enemies obtained ample supplies from England. Unable to endure the sight of his own friends perishing daily around him from famine, he entered into terms with the English, which Elizabeth, who was now in her death-sickness, ratified.

Q. What was the cost of the Irish war to Elizabeth?

A. Three millions sterling, and the destruction of the flower of her army. And after all, the subjugation of Ireland was partial and imperfect.

Q. In what respect does the mastery acquired

by England over Ireland differ from the conquest of England itself by the Normans?

A. The conquest of England by the Normans was rapid and complete; whereas the subjugation of Ireland has never been thoroughly accomplished even to the present day.

Q. In what year did Elizabeth die?

A. In the year 1603.

CHAPTER XVI.

The Reign of James the First

Q. Who succeeded to the throne on the death of Elizabeth?

A. James, king of Scotland.

Q. How did James treat the great northern chiefs, O'Neill and O'Donnell?

A. He confirmed the former in his title of earl of Tyrone; and revived, in favor of O'Donnell, the earldom of Tyrconnell.

Q. What salutary measures were adopted in Ireland by James?

A. He divided the whole kingdom into shire-ground, and settled the circuits of the judges on a permanent basis.

Q. What evil measures did this king inflict upon Ireland?

A. He reenacted the severe penal laws against the Catholics; and he soon turned his mind to the project of plundering all the proprietors of land in Ulster of their estates, in order to supplant them with English and Scottish adventurers

Q. How did the government commence their operations?

A. An anonymous letter was dropped in the privy-council chamber in Dublin Castle, imputing high treason to the two great Ulster lords, O'Neill and O'Donnell.

Q. How did these two nobles act?

A. They fled to the continent.

Q. Why?

A. Because they felt certain that the government had resolved on their destruction. They had not now sufficient forces to give battle to James; and they knew that if they stood their trial, a jury could be easily packed to convict them.

Q. What extent of land did James thus confiscate in Ulster?

A. Three hundred and eighty-five thousand acres.

Q. What was James's next step?

A. He summoned an Irish parliament, in order to obtain the sanction of law to his enormous wickedness.

Q. Did the parliament ratify the criminal acts of the king?

A. A fairly chosen parliament would not have done so; but James packed the parliament in order to secure a majority in his own favor.

Q. How did he manage?

A. He created forty new boroughs in one day, and the members returned for those boroughs were tutored to vote for the crown. [It is worthy of remark, that if it had not been for the creation of those forty close boroughs, the Union could never have been carried in the Irish house of commons.]

Q. What next scheme of plunder was projected by the king?

A. He issued what was called a "commission for the discovery of defective titles."

Q. What was the object of this commission?

A. To detect pretended flaws in the titles of the Irish landed proprietors to their estates, in order that the crown might either seize the property, or else compel the possessors to pay heavy fines for new titles.

Q. Who was placed at the head of this commission?

A. Sir William Parsons.

Q. What was Parsons's mode of proceeding?

A. Torture and subornation of perjury. In the celebrated case of the Byrnes of "the Ranelaghs," he suborned witnesses to swear an accusation of high treason against those gentlemen.

Q. Did the witnesses swear willingly?

A. No; Sir William forced them to swear up to the mark by the infliction of the most horrible tortures. He had one witness, named Archer, placed on a gridiron over a charcoal fire, burned in several parts of his body with hot irons, and barbarously flogged, in order to compel the wretched man to swear against the two Byrnes, whom the court had resolved to despoil of their estates.

Q. Did Archer yield?

A. Yes; when he was tortured beyond his endurance, he promised to swear all that Parsons wished; and by this diabolical proceeding, the proprietors were robbed of their inheritance.

Q. Did James intend to confiscate Connaught?

A. Yes; but ere he could effect his purpose, he was seized with an ague, and died.

Q. In what year?

A. In 1625.

CHAPTER XVII.

The Reign of Charles the First.

Q. What was king Charles's conduct towards his Irish subjects?

A. He followed in his father's footsteps: — bigotted hostility to the Catholics, treachery in making promises which he did not intend to perform, and steady perseverance in the plunder of estates; these were the leading features of his policy in Ireland.

Q. What was the declaration of the Irish Protestant bishops in 1626?

A. They declared that the toleration of "Popery" (by which they meant the Catholic religion) "was a grievous sin;" and that all persons concurring in such toleration became thereby involved in the guilt of "the Catholic apostacy."

Q. Whilst the bishops thus urged the persecution of the people, how was the court occupied?

A. In the wholesale plunder of estates. The judges were ranged on the side of the crown, and there were found complaisant jurors who were given an interest in finding verdicts against the proprietors.

Q. What step did the Catholic nobility and gentry of Ireland take in 1628?

A. They held a meeting in Dublin, at which

many Protestants of rank and influence also attended.

Q. What measure was agreed on at that meeting?

A. They framed a petition to the king, in which his majesty was requested to concede to his Irish subjects certain privileges termed the "graces."

Q. What were these "graces"?

A. Security of property; religious liberty; free trade; mitigation of the severities practised by the Established clergy; abolition of the private prisons kept by that clergy, for the incarceration of persons condemned in the church courts; a free pardon for all past political offences.

Q. What offer did the Irish make the king, on the condition of his granting the "graces"?

A. They offered him the sum — an enormous one for those days — of one hundred thousand pounds.

Q. Did Charles take the money?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. But did he grant the "graces"?

A. He did *not*.

Q. Whose fault was that?

A. It was partly the fault of his own weakness and bigotry. Some of his advisers exclaimed that the concession of the "graces" would exalt Popery on the ruins of Protestantism. The king took fright, and sheltered himself, for his shameful breach of promise, by allowing the blame to fall on Lord Strafford, who soon after became lord lieutenant of Ireland.

Q. What was Strafford's part in the affair?

A. He strongly urged Charles to break faith

with the Irish, and readily put himself forward to bear all the odium of the royal treachery.

Q. Of what other crimes was Strafford guilty?

A. He prepared to rob the Connaught proprietors of their estates, by means of the "Commission to Inquire into Defective Titles."

Q. How did that commission work?

A. The proprietors were put upon their trial, to show title. The judges were bribed by four shillings in the pound, on the first year's rent of the estates, to be paid them in the event of a verdict being found for the king. The jurors were also bribed; and the people were overawed, during the trials, by the presence of a strong military force.

Q. Did these precautions always secure verdicts for the crown?

A. They usually did. There were, however, one or two instances in which the honesty of the jurors stood out against both terror and corruption.

Q. How were such conscientious jurors treated by the government?

A. They were fined; pilloried; their ears cut off; their tongues bored through; and their foreheads marked with hot irons.

Q. On what authority do you state these facts?

A. On that of the Journals of the Irish House of Commons, vol. i. p. 307.

Q. Were not the proprietors afforded the alternative of redeeming their estates on payment of a fine to the crown for new titles?

A. Yes; Strafford in this manner extorted £17,000 from the O'Byrnes, and £70,000 from the London companies, to whom James the First had granted lands in Ulster.

Q. Did Strafford crush the woollen trade of Ireland?

A. Yes; he injured it to the utmost of his power, from the fear that it would successfully rival the English woollen manufacture.

Q. In the midst of all his crimes, do we find one solitary good conferred by Strafford upon Ireland?

A. Yes; he established and encouraged the manufacture of linen, which for a long time after flourished, and became a fruitful source of wealth to this country.

Q. What circumstances induced Charles to withdraw Strafford from Ireland?

A. The troubles in Scotland, which violently raged, required all the aid and counsel of the ablest ministers at the English court.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Civil War of 1641.

Q. What was the cause of the Irish civil war of 1641?

A. The Irish were impelled to take up arms by the intolerable oppressions of which, for many years, they had been the victims; and to defend themselves against the settled purpose of the government to exterminate their race.

Q. Into how many sections were the party who might be called "Irish" divided?

A. Into three. There were the ancient Irish clans; the Catholics of the English Pale; and the royalists.

Q. What party was opposed to those three?

A. The Puritans, or parliamentarian party.

Q. Where did the civil war begin?

A. In Ulster.

Q. Who headed the outbreak in that province?

A. Sir Phelim O'Neill.

Q. What was the object of the insurgents?

A. To recover the estates of that province for their ancient proprietors, and to secure freedom from English oppression for all the inhabitants of this kingdom.

Q. Was Sir Phelim O'Neill qualified to lead so great an undertaking?

A. No; he was a person of small abilities and ferocious temper.

Q. What was the immediate outrage that drove the men of Ulster to revolt?

A. A massacre committed on the inhabitants of Island Magee by an armed party who issued from the English garrison of Carrickfergus.

Q. Who were at that time the lords justices of Ireland?

A. Sir William Parsons (the same person who had contrived the horrid crime committed on the Byrnes) and Sir John Borlase.

Q. How did they act?

A. They published a proclamation, charging the great body of the Irish Catholics with being engaged in a conspiracy against the state.

Q. Has it not often been asserted that there was a great massacre of the Protestants committed by the Irish Catholics in 1641?

A. Yes, that assertion has been made.

Q. What is the character of that assertion?

A. It is a thorough and most impudent falsehood.

Q. What! was there no general massacre committed by the Irish?

A. None whatever.

Q. What is your reason for denying that there was a massacre?

A. The total absence of all proof that any massacre took place, and the irreconcilable statements of those who assert that a massacre *did* take place.

Q. Was there, then, no blood shed by the Irish?

A. Yes, there was blood shed; but it was in fair and open war; not by massacre.

Q. How do you show the total absence of sufficient proof that a massacre took place?

A. Because no mention whatsoever is made of any massacre at all in the government documents of the period; in which, if it had really happened, it would have infallibly been recorded.

Q. What documents do you speak of?

A. The proclamations and despatches of the lords justices at Dublin Castle.

Q. What is the date of the falsely alleged massacre?

A. The 23d of October, 1641.

Q. What are the dates of the despatches of the lords justices?

A. The 25th of October; the 25th of November; the 27th of November, and the 23d of December, in the same year. Now, the despatches bearing these four dates accuse the Irish Catholics of various acts of turbulence and plunder; they specify the murder of ten of the garrison of Lord Moore's house at Mellifont by a party of "rebels;" but they do *not* say one single word of any general massacre of the Protestants.

Q. What do you infer from this total silence on the subject?

A. That no massacre can have possibly occurred; since it is perfectly incredible that, if there had been any massacre, it should not have been mentioned in the despatches drawn up by the bitter enemies of the Irish people, who were always eager for an opportunity of making charges against them.

Q. What discrepancies strike you in the accounts of this pretended massacre?

A. The irreconcilable details, given by different authors, of the numbers said to have been slain in cold blood.

Q. How many does Milton say were massacred?

A. Six hundred thousand.*

Q. How many do Burton and Temple assert were massacred?

A. Three hundred thousand.

Q. How many do Frankland, May, and Baker say?

A. Two hundred thousand.

Q. How many does Rapin say?

A. One hundred and fifty-four thousand.

* Milton's words, as quoted by Harris in his "Historical Account of the Lives and Writings of James I. and Charles I.," (vol. II. p. 391,) London, 1814, are as follows:—

"The rebellion and horrid massacre of English Protestants in Ireland, to the amount of 154,000, in the province of Ulster only, by their own computation; *which, added to the other three, makes up the total sum of that slaughter, in all likelihood, four times as great.*"

In other words, about 616,000!—Milton probably became ashamed of this colossal falsehood; for in subsequent editions of his "Iconoclastes," the part of the sentence printed in italics is omitted. Harris professes to quote from the 2nd edition, p. 49.

Q. How many does Warwick say?

A. One hundred thousand.

Q. How many does Lord Clarendon say?

A. Forty or fifty thousand.

Q. How many does David Hume say?

A. Forty thousand.

Q. How many does the Rev. Dr. Warner * say?

A. Four thousand and twenty-eight.

Q. What observation does Dr. Warner make on the wholesale charges flung at the Irish people?

A. He says "It is easy enough to demonstrate the utter falsehood of every Protestant historian of the rebellion."

Q. What was the motive which induced the anti-Irish party to circulate those stupendous calumnies against the character of the country?

A. Because they had got possession of the estates of the native gentry; and it was in the highest degree their interest to deprive the old proprietors of all chance of sympathy or aid, by blackening, to the utmost, their character and that of their nation.

Q. When Milton, Burton, and Temple, respectively, alleged the massacre of their "six hundred thousand" and their "three hundred thousand" Protestants by the Irish Catholics, pray what was the total number of Protestants in the kingdom?

A. According to Sir William Petty, the best statist of his day, the entire number of Irish Protestants *then only amounted to about* 220,000.

Q. You have already stated that the Irish rose to defend themselves against the effort to exter-

* Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.

minate them. What evidence have you that the government intended their extermination?

A. The evidence of several Protestant historians.

Q. What does Dr. Leland say?

A. He says that "the favorite object of the Irish governors and the English parliament 'was the utter *extermination* of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland.'" *

Q. What does Carte say?

A. That "the lords justices had set their hearts on the *extirpation*, not only of the 'mere Irish,' but likewise of all of the old English families that were Roman Catholics." †

Q. What does Lord Clarendon say?

A. That the parliament party "had sworn to *extirpate*" the whole Irish nation. ‡

Q. What does the Rev. Dr. Warner say?

A. That it is evident that the lords justices "hoped for an *extirpation*, not of the mere Irish only, but of all the old English families that were Roman Catholics." §

Q. In the course of the civil war, did the government try to restrain the bloodthirsty excesses of their followers?

A. No; on the contrary, they urged them to the work of massacre.

Q. Can you state the words of their mandate for massacre?

A. Yes; in February, 1642, they issued an instruction to Lord Ormond, "that his lordship

* Leland's History of Ireland; Book V. chap. 4.

† Carte's Life of the duke of Ormonde, vol. I. p. 330.

‡ Clarendon, vol. I. p. 215.

§ Warner's History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland, p. 176.

do endeavor with his majesty's forces to wound, kill, slay, and destroy, by all the ways and means he may, all the said rebels, their adherents and relievers; and burn, waste, spoil, consume, destroy, and demolish, all the places, towns, and houses, where the said rebels are, or have been, relieved or harbored, and all the hay and corn there; *and kill and destroy all the men there inhabiting capable to bear arms.*"

Q. Who were the lords justices who issued this diabolical instruction?

A. Their names were Dillon, Rotheram, Loftus, Willoughby, Temple, and Meredith.

Q. Were their orders obeyed?

A. Yes; to the very letter, by their sanguinary subordinates.

Q. Where were the head-quarters of the confederated Irish?

A. At Kilkenny.

Q. Did the Irish leaders also draw up a manifesto to regulate the conduct of their army?

A. They did.

Q. What was the character of that manifesto?

A. Humane and merciful. The Irish leaders enjoined all their military commanders to prohibit, on pain of severe punishment, any wanton aggression on the persons or goods of the public; which injunction was further enforced by the penalty of excommunication, fulminated by the Catholic prelates against all such Catholics as should disobey it.

Q. Who were the principal leaders of the confederated Irish?

A. Roger Moore, Connor Macguire, O'Farrell, Clanricarde, Owen Roe O'Neill, Preston, Red

Hugh O'Donnell, Audley, Mac Mahon, and Sir Phelim O'Neill.

Q. Was their purpose to throw off their allegiance to the king?

A. By no means. At a conference between the Irish leaders of English and Irish descent, held, prior to the taking up of arms, at the hill of Crofty, the lords of the Pale asked Roger Moore to state distinctly his purposes; to which question Moore replied, "To maintain the royal prerogative, and make the subjects of Ireland as free as those of England."

Q. How did Sir Phelim O'Neill endeavor to raise troops?

A. By alleging that he had taken up arms for the king; and exhibiting a commission, purporting to be from his majesty, to which he had forged the royal seal and signature.

Q. What was the personal character of Sir Phelim?

A. It contrasted strongly with the dispositions of the other Irish leaders. He was a ferocious, headstrong man; but he in some measure redeemed his crimes by the noble candor which he displayed when on the point of being executed.

Q. What was that?

A. He might have saved his life, if he had then consented to confirm his own false statement, that Charles had authorized him to take up arms; but he preferred doing justice to the unhappy king, by honestly confessing his own forgery of the commission.

Q. What was the conduct of the earl of Ormond during the civil war?

A. Crafty and treacherous. We find him at

first making offers to the lords justices to march against the insurgents.

Q. Were his offers accepted?

A. Not at first. The lords justices sent forth Sir Charles Coote, a very monster of ferocity, to ravage the country and massacre the inhabitants.

Q. Where do we next find Ormond?

A. Offering the Irish government to carry on the war against the confederates, on condition of being supplied with ten thousand pounds for that purpose.

Q. Did the government accede to this offer?

A. They did not.

Q. Did Ormond then enter into treaty with the confederates?

A. Yes; he was authorized by Charles to do so.

Q. What was the result of his negotiation?

A. A cessation of hostilities for twelve months. The confederates, who had taken up arms to defend their lives, properties, and liberties, looked upon this truce as a boon, and undertook to supply the king with thirty thousand pounds in consideration of it.

Q. What did Ormond achieve by this negotiation?

A. Firstly, he gained supplies for the king from the confederates; secondly, he kept the confederates in a sort of hostile attitude; and thirdly, he tied them up for a whole year from making any use of their arms.

Q. How did the Puritan, or parliamentarian party, act on the occasion of this truce?

A. They loudly exclaimed against the *sin*, as they called it, of holding any terms whatsoever

with the murderous Papists, and they ordered their generals to break the truce.

Q. What was the next act of the confederates?

A. They implored Ormond to take the command of their army, and to lead them against Monroe, the parliamentarian general in Ulster.

Q. Did Ormond comply?

A. No; and the command was thereupon given to Lord Castlehaven.

Q. What were the next steps of both parties?

A. The Catholic confederates, and the Ultra-Protestant party, each sent a deputation to England, to state their proposals to the king.

Q. What did the Catholic party demand?

A. The total repeal of all penal laws against their religion; the perfect freedom of the Irish parliament; the exclusion from that parliament of all persons who had neither property nor residence in Ireland; an act, reversing all attainders of those who had borne arms in the war; an act to incapacitate the viceroy from acquiring lands in Ireland during his tenure of office; a rigid inquiry into all allegations of inhuman conduct and breaches of quarter upon either side during the troubles, and the due punishment of all convicted offenders.

Q. What did the Protestant party demand?

A. That all the penal laws against the Catholics should be enforced with the utmost rigor; that all Catholics should be disarmed; that they should be obliged to make good all injuries sustained in the war by the Protestants; that all Catholics, guilty of offences, should be punished; and that all the estates of which Sir William Parsons had achieved the forfeiture should be

vested in the crown, with the view to secure the British settlers in the possession of them.

Q. What curious inconsistency is observable in the Protestant proposal?

A. That the Catholics should be compelled to make good all injuries sustained by the Protestants; and at the same time be totally deprived of the means of so doing, by the confirmation of the forfeiture of their estates.

Q. How did Charles treat the Catholic deputation?

A. He gave them civil words, and then committed the decision of their claims to Ormond.

Q. What was Ormond's policy?

A. Procrastination; and he postponed all final settlement until the English Puritan party had acquired such power, as to render the king's ruin certain.

Q. Why did Ormond delay the settlement?

A. Because he was secretly resolved not to grant the demands of the Catholics; and he tried to obtain their assistance for Charles, without committing himself by promise or treaty.

Q. What was the king's conduct throughout the entire negotiation?

A. It was marked by duplicity and faithlessness; the effort to extort as much from the Irish, and to grant them as little as possible; the acceptance of money and men from our nation, on the faith of solemn promises which Charles neither kept, nor, in all probability, intended to keep.

Q. Through whom were those promises conveyed to the Irish confederates?

A. Through Herbert, earl of Glamorgan, the son of the marquis of Worcester.

Q. Did Ormond at last sign the treaty with the confederates?

A. He did; on the 28th of May, 1646.

Q. What at last induced him to do so?

A. The pressing necessity of the king's affairs, which were every day becoming more desperate in consequence of the delay.

Q. What was the first battle fought in Ireland after that treaty?

A. The battle of Benburb; in which Owen Roe O'Neill, commanding the Catholic forces on the part of the king, defeated the more numerous army of the parliamentarians, commanded by Monroe.

Q. Meanwhile, what were the king's fortunes in England?

A. Most disastrous. He met with a succession of defeats, and at last surrendered himself into the hands of the Scotch Puritans, who sold him to the English parliament for the sum of £400,000.

Q. What was then Ormond's policy?

A. As soon as he saw the king's affairs were hopeless, he began to make terms with the parliamentarians; and he even pretended that Charles had instructed him to prefer the alliance of that party to the friendship of the Irish.

Q. When Ormond deserted the confederates to negotiate with the parliamentarians, what conditions did he make for himself with the latter?

A. He bargained for £3000 a year for his wife; £14,000 to make good his own personal losses in the war; and liberty to reside in England on condition of not disturbing the new order of things.

Q. Was this last stipulation carried into effect?

A. No; on arriving in England he was ap-

prised that the parliament had issued orders to arrest him; and he accordingly escaped to France.

Q. What were the fortunes of the confederate Catholics?

A. Unprosperous. They were divided by the opposite counsels of Rinuncini, the Pope's nuncio, and his party on the one hand, and the more moderate party on the other.

Q. Did Ormond return to Ireland from France?

A. He did, in September, 1648.

Q. Where was the king at that time?

A. A close prisoner at Carisbrook Castle in the Isle of Wight, in the hands of the parliamentarians.

Q. How had Ormond employed his time whilst in France?

A. In endeavoring to obtain from the French court supplies to carry on the war for the king in Ireland.

Q. Did he succeed?

A. So badly, that the slender sum that court advanced him little more than defrayed the expenses of his voyage. On arriving at Cork, he had no more than thirty French louisd'or for his military chest.

Q. Did he renew his treaty with the confederates?

A. Yes; on the 16th of January, 1649, he ratified that treaty, granting every concession demanded by the Catholics.

Q. Had he the king's authority for this ratification?

A. Yes; so long before as the 10th of October, in the previous year, Charles had written Ormond a letter from his prison, in which he says: "Be

not startled at my great concessions concerning Ireland, *for they will come to nothing.*"

Q. On what day was the king beheaded by the parliamentarians?

A. On the 30th of January, 1649.

CHAPTER XIX.

The Commonwealth.

Q. Where was Ormond when the news of the king's death reached him?

A. At Youghall, in the county Cork.

Q. What was his first act on learning the event?

A. To proclaim the prince of Wales king, by the title of Charles the Second.

Q. Where was the young king at that time?

A. At the Hague, in Holland.

Q. Did he begin by confirming the peace which Ormond had signed with the confederate Catholics?

A. Yes; he wrote from the Hague "that he had received, and was extremely well satisfied with, the articles of peace with the Irish confederates, and would confirm wholly and entirely all that was contained in them." *

Q. Did he keep that promise to the Irish?

A. No; for in order to secure the crown of Scotland for himself, he found it was necessary to break faith with the Catholics, whom the Scottish Puritans detested.

* Cart. Orig. Let. vol. II. pp. 363, 367.

Q. What, then, was Charles's next declaration?

A. Having landed in Scotland in June, 1650, he publicly declared "that he did detest and abhor Popery, superstition, and idolatry, together with prelacy; resolving not to tolerate, much less to allow those in any part of his dominions, and to endeavor the extirpation thereof to the utmost of his power."

Q. What did the king further say with regard to the peace with the Irish confederates, which he had so recently promised to observe inviolate?

A. "That it was null and void." . . . "That he was convinced in his conscience of the sinfulness and unlawfulness of it, and of his allowing them (the confederates) the liberty of the Popish religion; for which he did from his heart desire to be deeply humbled before the Lord; and for having sought unto such unlawful help for the restoring of him to his throne."

Q. What effect had this base perfidy of Charles on the Irish people?

A. It necessarily withdrew many of them from their allegiance; since it showed them how utterly unworthy of trust the king was; and with what readiness he could sacrifice them to their bitterest enemies in order to attain his own ends.

Q. Had the Catholic confederates been invariably faithful to the late unhappy king?

A. So faithful, that Ormond himself had told his majesty that several of the soldiers had starved by their arms, *and that he could persuade one half of his army to starve outright.*

Q. Were the Protestants equally faithful to that unfortunate monarch?

A. So far from it, that their leaders, Sir Charles Coote and Lord Broghill, with the entire force under their command, and the whole army in the north, had deserted from the late king to the Puritan rebels.

Q. Did the young king's base ingratitude to the Irish Catholics, and his pledge to extirpate Popery, avail to secure him in his throne?

A. No; the English parliamentarians refused to trust him, despite his professions; and he was obliged to fly from England, to save his life.

Q. Who was Oliver Cromwell?

A. One of the parliamentarian generals.

Q. In what year did he come to Ireland?

A. In 1649; the year of the late king's murder.

Q. How did Cromwell begin operations in Ireland?

A. He stormed Drogheda with a force of 10,000 men and a well-appointed battering artillery.

Q. How did the garrison defend the town?

A. With great bravery. They twice repulsed their assailants; but, on the third assault, Colonel Wall being killed, the garrison became dismayed, and offered to surrender the town on promise of quarter.

Q. Did Cromwell, on taking possession of the town, observe this promise of quarter?

A. No; he massacred the inhabitants in cold blood. For three days the slaughter continued; and Cromwell, in his despatch to the English parliament, thanked God "*for that great mercy*," as he called it.

Q. Did Cromwell also besiege Wexford?

A. He did, and he massacred three hundred women who had assembled at the cross.

Q. In which of the three kingdoms did the friends of the royal cause hold out the longest against Cromwell?

A. In Ireland. The Catholic Irish were the last to lay down their arms, and to relinquish their exertions in the king's behalf, as Lord Orrery testifies.

Q. How did the Catholic bishops act?

A. They excommunicated all persons who should go over to the rebels. And Lord Clanricarde, acting on the advice of the Catholic assembly convened at Loughrea, issued a proclamation denouncing the pains of high treason against all persons serving in Cromwell's army, or in treaty with him; unless within twenty-one days they quitted that service, and abandoned all communication with the rebels.

Q. What were the chief measures of Cromwell's Irish government?

A. Severe laws against the Catholic religion and priesthood. The ancient possessions of the men who had fought for the king were given away to the hordes of Cromwellian adventurers; and all the loyal Irish who survived the late war, and who could be collected, were driven into the province of Connaught, and forbidden to re-cross the Shannon under pain of death.

Q. In what year did Cromwell die?

A. In 1659.

CHAPTER XX.

The Reign of Charles the Second.

Q. In what year was Charles the Second restored to his throne?

A. In 1660.

Q. How did he treat the Cromwellian party who had fought against his father and himself in Ireland?

A. He confirmed them in the possession of the estates they had seized from his loyal, suffering, Irish Catholic subjects; and two of the chief Cromwellian leaders — lord Broghill and Sir Charles Coote — he favored, by creating the former earl of Orrery, and the latter earl of Mountrath.

Q. When did the new Irish parliament meet?

A. In 1661.

Q. Of what materials was the house of commons composed?

A. Chiefly of the adventurers who had acquired estates under Cromwell.

Q. What was their character?

A. They were upstarts from the very lowest classes; they were extremely ignorant; inflated with spiritual pride; outrageously impudent and self-sufficient.

Q. What were the subjects that engaged the attention of this parliament?

A. The restoration of the Episcopal Protestant Church, and the settlement of the confiscated estates in possession of the Cromwellian proprietors.

Q. Were there any Catholic members in that parliament?

A. Yes, a few; there were one or two Catholic members for boroughs, and a small number of Catholic representatives of counties.

Q. How did the Puritan majority treat these?

A. They tried to get rid of them; first, by imposing an oath of qualification which no Catholic could take.

Q. Did that scheme succeed?

A. No; for the bill they prepared for imposing the oath was quashed by the English privy-council.

Q. What did they next try?

A. They tried to expel the Catholic members by a vote of the house; but the lords justices condemned that project as being an infraction on the royal prerogative.

Q. How were the Puritanic members of this parliament induced to vote for the restoration of the Episcopal Church?

A. By the dexterous management of Ormond, who postponed the question of settling the estates until after the question of the church should have been disposed of. The Puritan members thus found it their interest to conciliate Ormond by voting for the establishment of the Episcopal Church.

Q. Did the old proprietors make a struggle for their estates?

A. Yes; their claims were brought before the English privy-council, and they selected Richard Talbot, the earl of Tyrconnel, as the patron of their case.

Q. What was the basis of their claims?

A. Right and justice. They also relied much on the merits of their own loyalty to Charles and his father, when contrasted with the rebellious

conduct of the Cromwellian party, who had caused the late king's murder.

Q. Did these claims and merits weigh with Charles?

A. Not in the least. He looked upon the ruined Irish loyalists, who had lost their all in his service, as being too weak to give him any annoyance in return for his desertion of their interests; whereas, the Cromwellians were strong enough to render it worth the king's while to conciliate them.

Q. Did any other motives actuate Charles?

A. Yes; he wanted to preserve what was called "the English interest in Ireland;" and as he conceived that the new Cromwellian proprietors, from their bitter hatred of the Irish people, were the fittest tools to effectuate that object, he readily gave them the assistance of his influence.

Q. How did Ormond act?

A. He at first affected a desire to serve the Irish claimants; but, as the Cromwellian parliament had bribed him with a grant of £30,000, the Catholics suspected his sincerity and refused his aid.

Q. What was the final result?

A. The confirmation of the immense majority of the Cromwellian soldiers and adventurers in the forfeited estates; and the exclusion of nearly all the Irish claimants from any redress whatsoever.

Q. Had Ormond profited by his share in the public events since the year 1641?

A. Yes; his estates, prior to that period, had been worth about £7000 a year; but after the Act of Settlement, his property amounted to the annual value of £80,000.

Q. Have the Catholic gentry of the present day

an interest in subverting the Cromwellian settlement of property?

A. No; for a large proportion of the confiscated lands have passed, by purchase, into the hands of Catholic proprietors.

CHAPTER XXI.

The Reign of Charles II. continued.

Q. What act affecting Ireland was next passed by the English Parliament?

A. An act to prevent the importation of Irish cattle into England.

Q. Was this act observed?

A. Yes, until the great fire of London; when the Irish, having nothing else to send the sufferers, sent them a present of cattle for their relief.

Q. How did the English receive this gift?

A. They represented it as an attempt to evade the cattle act.

Q. Did Ormond try to serve any Irish interest?

A. Yes; he promoted the linen and woollen manufacturers, and invited over the ablest foreign artizans to instruct the natives.

Q. Meanwhile, how were the hot Protestant party in England occupied?

A. In devising and circulating rumors of Popish plots, conspiracies, and intended massacres.

Q. What measures did they recommend Ormond to take?

A. They advised him to expel the Catholic inhabitants from every walled town in Ireland, and

to arrest every peer and gentleman of Irish lineage.

Q. What was their object in giving this advice?

A. To goad the Irish into a rebellion, in order to afford an opportunity for fresh confiscations.

Q. Did Ormond act on their advice?

A. He did not; and thus Ireland was preserved in quiet, and the hopes of those persons who desired new forfeitures were disappointed.

Q. Who was Oliver Plunket?

A. The Catholic archbishop of Armagh.

Q. What was his character as a politician?

A. He had ever been thoroughly loyal to the Stuart dynasty.

Q. What was his fate?

A. The English zealots dragged him to London, to answer for his alleged participation in a rebellious conspiracy. He offered to bring witnesses from Ireland to establish his innocence, but was refused the time necessary for that purpose. He was of course found guilty, and hanged, although not a tittle of credible evidence was produced against him.

Q. In what year did Charles die?

A. In 1684; not without the suspicion of being poisoned.

CHAPTER XXII.

The Reign of James the Second.

Q. Did James the Second remove Ormond from the government of Ireland?

A. Yes; and replaced him by his kinsman, the earl of Clarendon.

Q. What was Clarendon's policy with regard to the Catholics?

A. He admitted them into the Privy Council, and advanced them to the bench.

Q. What was James's policy with reference to the religious differences of his subjects?

A. He published a declaration, giving equal civil privileges to all classes of religionists.

Q. What was the great principle of the English revolution of 1688?

A. Representative government, as opposed to the arbitrary power of despotic monarchy.

Q. What step did James take when he heard that William of Orange had landed in England to contest the throne with him?

A. He fled to France.

Q. Who was at that time lord lieutenant of Ireland?

A. The earl of Tyrconnel.

Q. What was Tyrconnel's conduct?

A. He pretended to the Protestants that he was desirous to negotiate with William; whilst he augmented and strengthened by all the means in his power the Catholic army.

Q. How did the enemies of the Irish Catholics act at this juncture?

A. They repeated the old trick, so frequently used, of accusing the Catholics of a purpose to massacre the Protestants; and anonymous letters, professing to give the most accurate details of the plot, were extensively circulated amongst the Protestant party by designing persons.

Q. What terms did William of Orange offer to the Irish Catholics?

A. He offered them the possession of a third part of the churches in the kingdom; equality of

civil and religious privileges with all other religious persuasions; and as full security of person and property as any other class of the subjects of the crown enjoyed.

Q. Did the Irish Catholics accept these offers?

A. They did not. They believed themselves bound in conscience to preserve their loyalty to James, and they looked upon William as a usurper.

Q. What were King James's movements?

A. He resolved to strike a blow for his crown in Ireland; and accordingly sailed from France to Kinsale, where he landed on the 12th of March, 1689.

Q. What reception did he meet?

A. A most loyal one from the corporations, gentry, and clergy. Even the clergy of the Protestant church vied with the Catholic priesthood in their ardent professions of allegiance.

Q. When did the Irish parliament meet?

A. In May, 1689. The king opened the session in person.

Q. Was that parliament a fair representation of the Irish people?

A. Yes; it included Catholics and Protestants. The former predominated in the House of Commons. There were Protestant bishops in the House of Lords, but no Catholic prelates.

Q. What were the topics of the king's speech?

A. His majesty denounced all violations of the rights of conscience as abhorrent to his principles; he promised security of property; he upheld the perfect equality of Protestants and Catholics; he called the attention of parliament to the trading and manufacturing interests of the nation; and recommended to their care those persons whom

the Act of Settlement had unjustly deprived of their property.

Q. What acts did this parliament pass?

A. An act for the full establishment of liberty of conscience. This act had the warm assent of every Catholic member of this parliament, in which the great majority of members were Catholics.

Q. Was it accordant with the spirit of the Irish Catholics at large?

A. Preëminently so. Neither then, nor at any other time, did the Irish Catholics desire the exclusion of any class of their countrymen from any political privilege which they themselves enjoyed.

Q. What other measures did the parliament of 1689 enact?

A. It enacted that tithes should be paid by each person to the pastor of his own communion. The two houses, also, passed a bill repealing Poynings's law,* and establishing the legislative and judicial independence of Ireland; but it was negatived by the miserable James, to whom it appeared inconsistent with his favorite notion of "an English interest" in Ireland.

Q. Was the Act of Settlement repealed this session?

A. Yes; and the forfeited estates which the Cromwellian adventurers had obtained, were thereby restored to the former owners, who had lost them through their loyalty to the house of Stuart.

Q. What grant did the Irish Parliament make James?

A. Twenty thousand pounds per month.

* See page 61, *ante*.

Q. What financial scheme had James recourse to?

A. He issued a proclamation, doubling the value of money.

Q. How did the traders and merchants evade this proclamation?

A. By instantly doubling the prices of their goods.

Q. Did James besiege the city of Derry?

A. Yes; the assault was commanded by General Hamilton; the defence was conducted by a dissenting clergyman named Walker; and when we consider the want of previous discipline, the want of provisions in the garrison during a great portion of the siege, and the dispiriting tendency of the treacherous conduct of Lundy, the governor of the town, — it is impossible to estimate too highly the spirit, valor, and gallantry of the Protestant people of Derry.

Q. What was the issue of the conflict?

A. The Derry men kept their town for William; and the assailants retreated on the arrival of vessels in the harbor bearing provisions for the gallant inhabitants — whose defence forms one of the most brilliant achievements in the annals of modern warfare.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Struggle between James and William.

Q. What measures did William of Orange take against James, in Ireland?

A. He sent his Dutch general, Count Schomberg, with an army of ten thousand men, into this country.

Q. When and where did they land?

A. They landed on the 13th of August, 1689, at Bangor Bay, near Carrickfergus.

Q. What was the character of the Williamite army?

A. The Rev. Dr. Gorge, who was chaplain to Schomberg, describes them as wallowing in profligacy too odious and loathsome for description. They were, however, brave and well-trained soldiers.

Q. What was Schomberg's first attempt?

A. The siege of Carrickfergus.

Q. Who was the Jacobite governor of the town?

A. M'Carthy More.

Q. Did he make a gallant defence?

A. He did not surrender until his last grain of powder was exhausted; and he then obtained honorable terms from Schomberg.

Q. Did Schomberg's army observe the terms of capitulation?

A. No; they scandalously violated their engagements, and rioted in every excess of flagitious license. Female virtue was outraged, and private property was plundered and devastated.

Q. Did the native Irish, in the various civil wars of the kingdom, ever offer injury or insult to the females of the opposite party?

A. Never; and this fact is a proud and honorable boast for our nation; especially when contrasted with the beastly licentiousness that marked the conduct of the English soldiery in Ireland in every civil strife.

Q. Did Schomberg countenance the ruffianism of his men at Carrickfergus?

A. No; he endeavored to check them; and thereby obtained their hatred.

Q. Whither did he advance from Carrickfergus?

A. Along the coast of Dundalk.

Q. In what condition did he find the country?

A. Reduced to a mere desert by the previous civil warfare.

Q. What was the state of Schomberg's men?

A. They suffered severely from the want of provisions, and the fatigue of marching through a boggy and mountainous country.

Q. What were the counsels of James's generals?

A. They were disposed to retreat before Schomberg, until the earl of Tyrconnel reassured them by promising a large reënforcement.

Q. What was Schomberg's conduct?

A. He paused near Dundalk, and fortified his camp with entrenchments.

Q. Did James's army engage that of Schomberg?

A. No; the timid and vacillating spirit of the king appears to have influenced his generals. The men were dissatisfied at not being led against the enemy.

Q. What were Marshal Rosen's words to James?

A. "If your majesty had ten kingdoms, you would lose them."

Q. Why did not Schomberg engage James's army?

A. Because his men were exhausted by disease

and hunger, and must have inevitably been defeated if they quitted their position.

Q. What losses did the Williamites sustain just then?

A. They lost Sligo and Jamestown, which were stormed and taken by the gallant Sarsfield, earl of Lucan; a man of whom Irishmen may well be proud.

Q. How did Schomberg's campaign terminate?

A. In the destruction, by disease and famine, of the greater portion of his army; while no advantage of any importance had been gained by his efforts against James, excepting the capture of the fort of Charlemont.

Q. On what course did William then resolve?

A. On proceeding to Ireland himself.

Q. Where and when did he land?

A. At Carrickfergus on the 14th of June, 1690.

Q. By whom was he attended?

A. By Prince George of Denmark, the duke of Ormond, and a large train of followers of rank.

Q. What was the number of William's army?

A. Thirty-six thousand picked men.

Q. What were James's movements?

A. As soon as he learned that William had landed, he proceeded to join his army, which were now encamped on the southern bank of the Boyne, near Drogheda.

Q. When did William's army arrive at the Boyne?

A. At an early hour in the morning of the 30th of June.

Q. How were James's army then posted?

A. They had Drogheda to their right; a deep

bog to their left; the Boyne in their front, and some hedges between their lines and the river, which could be used as breast-works for infantry.

Q. What peril did William escape?

A. While reconnoitring James's position from the opposite bank of the river, he was struck on the right shoulder by a ball from James's lines; whilst another shot killed a man and two horses in his immediate vicinity. He, however, escaped with a slight wound, and rode through his army to counteract the dispiriting effects of a report of his death that had been spread.

Q. How was James affected by the approach of battle?

A. He had blustered a great deal upon the previous day about his anxiety to risk an engagement; but he now was eagerly anxious to avoid encountering his opponent.

Q. Was this from sheer poltroonery?

A. Partly it was so, no doubt; but William's army was so vastly superior to his own in artillery, as well as in numbers, that the French generals of James would have willingly escaped an engagement. The Irish, however, expresed their perfect readiness to fight.

CHAPTER XXIV.

The Battle of the Boyne, and the Sieges of Athlone and Limerick.

Q. On what day was the Battle of the Boyne fought?

A. On the first of July, 1690.

Q. Did James take an active part in the battle?

A. No; he looked on at the contest from the hill of Donore; and when a portion of William's army gave way before the charge of the Irish dragoons, he exclaimed, "Spare, O spare my English subjects!"

Q. What was the progress and event of the battle?

A. Great valor was displayed on both sides; but the great superiority, in point of numbers and equipments, on the part of William's army, decided the victory in their favor. Exclusively of the numerical advantage, the Williamites were encouraged by the presence of a monarch who led them with bravery and skill; whilst the Jacobites were dispirited by the cowardice and incapacity of the miserable James.

Q. What did the Irish soldiers say when James fled to Dublin?

A. Their cry was, "Change kings, and we'll fight the battle over again."

Q. What was the conduct of William's soldiers after the battle?

A. The Enniskilleners, and some other desperadoes, murdered in cold blood many of the peasantry whom curiosity had drawn to the spot.

Q. Who received James at Dublin Castle?

A. Lady Tyrconnel received him on the staircase; and when his majesty, with base ingratitude and falsehood, ascribed the event of the battle to the cowardice of the Irish, "who," he said, "had run away," Lady Tyrconnel replied with spirit: "Your majesty, I see, has won the race!" In truth, James had not waited for the end of the en-

gagement, but had precipitately fled to Dublin, leaving the day yet undecided.

Q. What commission did William issue?

A. A commission to confiscate the estates of all the Jacobite leaders who had taken up arms.

Q. What was William's next military enterprise?

A. The seige of Athlone. This service was intrusted to General Douglas, who was placed at the head of ten regiments of foot, and five of horse.

Q. Who was the Jacobite governor of Athlone?

A. Colonel Grace.

Q. When summoned by Douglas to surrender, what was Grace's answer?

A. He fired a pistol at the messenger, desiring him to take that as his reply.

Q. What was Douglas's next proceeding?

A. He constructed a battery in front of the town, and opened a fire on the castle.

Q. How did the garrison meet the attack?

A. By returning Douglas's fire from the castle with tremendous effect. His best gunner was killed, and his battery was destroyed. He was accordingly obliged to raise the siege.

Q. When did William besiege Limerick?

A. On the 9th of August, 1690.

Q. What was the conduct of his army prior to the siege?

A. They renewed the brutalities they had practised at Athlone. They plundered and burned the country, and committed acts of the grossest licentiousness.

Q. What defence did the Irish garrison of Limerick make?

A. A most gallant one. Even the women mingled amongst the soldiers, and fought as valiantly as the men. They declared that they would rather be torn in pieces than submit to the power of wretches who were guilty of such foul abominations as the Williamite army had committed.

Q. How long did the conflict last?

A. For three hours; when William retreated from Limerick, seeing that success was perfectly hopeless.

Q. How many men did William lose?

A. Two thousand.

Q. How did the advances of his army affect the condition of the Protestants who inhabited the country?

A. Most disastrously; for the Protestants in the neighborhood of Limerick, and also of Athlone, had previously lived in security under the protections they had taken out from the Jacobite garrisons of those places; but on the approach of William's army, they had surrendered their protections and gone over to the invading army; by whom they were treated with the utmost indignity, and even brutality.

Q. What walled city was next attacked?

A. Cork, which was taken after a brave defence; the inhabitants having stipulated for protection for their persons and property.

Q. Were these terms observed?

A. No; a Williamite mob abused the persons and plundered the property of the Catholic and Jacobite inhabitants; in which acts of license they were joined by the triumphant soldiery.

Q. What was the amount of the confiscations under William?

A. One million and sixty thousand acres.

Q. What town of importance did William besiege the ensuing year?

A. Athlone.

Q. Who conducted the assault?

A. General Ginckle.

Q. When did he appear before the town?

A. On the 18th of June, 1691.

Q. What resistance did the garrison make?

A. A most valiant one. The assailing force was now far superior to that which General Douglas had brought against the town on the occasion of the previous siege.

Q. How many cannon did Ginckle mount on his battery?

A. Ten; with which he opened a tremendous fire on the town and castle. The bridge had been broken by Grace in the former siege, and the English now repaired the breach with wood-work, under cover of the smoke of burning buildings.

Q. How did the Irish meet this attempt?

A. A sergeant and ten men, cased in armor, rushed forth from the town to destroy the wooden passage the English had made.

Q. What was the fate of this brave little party?

A. They were destroyed by a shot from the English battery.

Q. Was their attempt renewed by others?

A. Yes; a second party from the town filled their places, and succeeded in destroying the wood-work on the bridge. Only two of this party survived their desperate exploit.

Q. What was the result on the invading force?

A. Ginckle was unable for nine days to repeat his assault.

Q. When he *did* renew his attack, how did the Irish act?

A. They threw grenades into all the wooden works on which he had been occupied during the interval; and all his pontoons, galleries, and breast-works, were consumed to ashes.

Q. What was the conduct of King James's French general, St. Ruth?

A. He most absurdly removed the brave men who so ably garrisoned Athlone, and supplied their places with inferior regiments.

Q. Meanwhile, how was Ginckle occupied?

A. He seriously debated with his officers whether he should abandon the siege, or renew the assault. His own opinion was in favor of retreating; his officers, however, prevailed on him to renew his attempt by fording the river next morning.

Q. How did Ginckle try to throw the garrison off their guard?

A. He began to remove his guns from the batteries, as if he were preparing to depart.

Q. Did this trick deceive the Irish officers?

A. No; and they implored St. Ruth to prepare for another assault on the town.

Q. What was St. Ruth's reply?

A. "The English," said he, "will not dare to try it."

Q. What did the Irish General, Sarsfield, answer?

A. "No enterprise," said Sarsfield, "is too great for English valor."

Q. Did St. Ruth comply with the advice of his Irish officers?

A. No; he was obstinate and self-sufficient, and refused to believe that Ginckle would really hazard another attack. He accordingly neglected to make any preparations of defence; and on the

next morning the English had forded the river and entered the town ere St. Ruth had wakened from his slumbers.

Q. Where did St. Ruth retreat to, with his army, after he had lost Athlone?

A. To the hill of Kilcommodon, near the castle of Aughrim, in the county of Galway.

Q. On what day was the battle of Aughrim fought?

A. On the 12th of July, 1691.

Q. What were the fortunes of the day?

A. Victory seemed for a long time to favor the Irish, who succeeded in several charges, and were quite triumphant on the right and in the centre; when St. Ruth was killed by a shot from the enemy's cannon. Confusion overspread the Irish army on the loss of their commander, and was speedily followed by defeat.

Q. What was the character of St. Ruth?

A. He was undoubtedly a brave and able general; but his merits were counterbalanced by his excessive presumption, self-confidence, vanity and obstinacy.

Q. Did William renew his attempt against Limerick?

A. Yes; on the 25th August, 1691.

Q. To whom did he commit the conduct of the second siege?

A. To Ginckle

Q. Was the siege protracted?

A. Yes, for several weeks; and after an obstinate struggle, in which the greatest heroism was displayed on both sides, the city surrendered upon the terms imbodied in the celebrated "Treaty of Limerick."

CHAPTER XXV.

The Treaty of Limerick.

Q. What were the advantages promised to the Irish Catholics in the treaty of Limerick?

A. All the Catholics were to enjoy the exercise of their religion in as full and free a manner as they had done in the reign of Charles the Second. It was stipulated also that, as soon as parliament met, their majesties should try to obtain for the Catholics additional legislative security for the freedom of their worship.

Q. What was the next provision in the treaty?

A. That all the inhabitants of the counties of Limerick, Cork, Clare, Kerry, and Mayo, who had taken up arms for King James, should possess their estates and pursue their callings and professions unmolested.

Q. What other right was secured to the Catholic gentry?

A. They were allowed to keep arms.

Q. And what oaths were required to be taken by them?

A. None, except the oath of allegiance to William and Mary.

Q. What provision was made by the treaty for all officers and soldiers who might refuse to remain in Ireland on the above conditions?

A. They were to be sent to France at the expense of the government.

Q. What was then the number of the Irish army at Limerick?

A. They were fifteen thousand strong.

Q. How many of them resolved to depart from Ireland and enter the service of France?

A. About twelve thousand five hundred. They formed the commencement of the celebrated Irish Brigade, which, during the last century, contributed so greatly to the honor of French arms.

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Reign of William and Mary, concluded.

Q. Was the treaty of Limerick faithfully observed by the government?

A. No; it was shamefully violated.

Q. What did Dr. Dopping, the Protestant bishop of Meath, say of it?

A. He preached a sermon before the lords justices at Christ's Church, Dublin, in which he affirmed that Protestants were not bound to keep faith with Papists; at the same time denouncing the articles of the treaty.

Q. Was the bishop replied to?

A. He was, by another Protestant prelate, Doctor Moreton, bishop of Kildare; who alleged that the treaty was binding on men of good faith, and that Protestants could not be exonerated from keeping their promises to Papists.

Q. Did the English parliament violate the treaty?

A. Yes. By an audacious usurpation of power over the Irish legislature, the English parliament enacted, "that all the members of the Irish legislature should take the *oath of supremacy;*" although the treaty of Limerick had expressly

provided, in its ninth article, that no oath whatsoever should be imposed upon the Irish Catholics except the *oath of allegiance.* In subsequent reigns, the treaty was yet more flagrantly violated.

Q. Did the Irish parliament, at this period of national depression and weakness, protect in any way the interests of their country?

A. Yes; the Irish house of commons rejected a money-bill which had been forwarded from England for their fiat; asserting their own exclusive right to originate all money-bills.

Q. Of what materials was the Irish house of commons at this time composed?

A. Chiefly of the sons of Cromwellian adventurers, and other supporters of what was called "the Protestant interest." There were a very small number of Catholics yet in the house.

Q. How did that parliament violate the treaty of Limerick?

A. By an act disabling the Catholics from educating their children, or being guardians of their own or other people's children; also by an act disarming the Catholics; and by another act to expel all Catholic prelates and priests from the kingdom. They also passed laws to prevent the intermarriages of Protestants with Catholics; and to prevent Catholics from being *attorneys or gamekeepers.*

Q. What address did the English parliament present to William in 1698 on the subject of Ireland?

A. An address praying him to *discourage* the woollen manufacture of Ireland.

Q. What was William's answer?

A. "I shall do all that in me lies to discourage

the woollen manufacture of Ireland, and to encourage the linen manufacture therein."

Q. Did William keep his promise to discourage our woollen trade?

A. He did.

Q. Did he keep his promise to encourage our linen trade?

A. He did not.

Q. In what year did William die?

A. In 1701. He was succeeded by his cousin and sister-in-law, Anne Stuart.

CHAPTER XXVII.

The Reign of Queen Anne.

Q. What enactments were passed against the Catholics in the reign of Anne?

A. The code generally known as the penal laws.

Q. What were the penalties inflicted by that code?

A. The Catholics were thereby rendered incapable of acquiring landed property in fee, or by lease for any term longer than thirty-one years; and even for that limited term they were not permitted to possess an interest in their land greater than one third the amount of the rent, on pain of forfeiting the entire to the first Protestant who should discover the extent of such interest.

Q. State some other enactments of the code.

A. If the child of a Papist possessing an estate should conform to Protestantism, the parent was debarred from disposing of his property by sale,

mortgage, or will; and the court of chancery was empowered to order an annuity out of the estate, for the use of such conforming child.

Q. What other penal laws were passed?

A. Catholics were declared incapable of inheriting the estates of their Protestant relations. The estate of a Catholic who had not a Protestant heir was to be divided in gavel among all his children. All men were to be qualified for office, or as voters at elections, by taking the oath of abjuration, *and by receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as administered in the Established Protestant Church!!!* A Catholic possessing a horse — no matter of what value — was compelled to surrender the horse to any Protestant on payment of five pounds.

Q. Was there a more specific violation of the treaty of Limerick than the scandalous enactments you have mentioned?

A. Yes; the parliament enacted a law which expressly, and by name, deprived the Catholics of Galway and Limerick of the protection guaranteed to them by that treaty.

Q. Was a bribe held out to Catholic priests to become Protestants?

A. Yes; a grant of forty pounds per annum was made to every "Popish" priest who should embrace the established religion.

Q. What was the object of the Irish Protestant parliament in their shameless infraction of the treaty of Limerick, and their violent and ferocious enactments against their Catholic fellow-countrymen?

A. They were haunted by incessant fears that the Catholics would try to recover the estates which had been wrested from them by every

variety of flagitious crime; and they therefore labored to depress and weaken the objects of their terror to the utmost.

Q. Were there any instances of Protestant good faith in that dark and dreary period?

A. Yes; many instances in private life. Estated Catholics who dreaded "Protestant discoverers" often made over their properties in trust to friendly Protestants, even in the humblest ranks, in order to evade the operation of the demon-law; and in no one case did the Protestants who were thus confided in abuse the trust which the Catholic proprietors reposed in them. It is said that one poor Protestant barber had half the Catholic estates of a southern county in trust.

Q. Was there, in this reign, a rumor of an attempt by the son of James the Second to recover the crown of these kingdoms?

A. Yes; in 1708.

Q. What effect had that rumor on the affairs of the Irish Catholics?

A. It served as a pretext to the Protestant authorities to arrest forty-one of the principal Catholic nobility and gentry.

Q. How did the Irish Catholics at that time feel disposed towards James the Second's family?

A. They regarded them with aversion and disgust; for they had a bitter experience of their tyrannical disposition, treachery, falsehood, and base ingratitude to those who had fought and bled in their cause, and lost their all in their service.

Q. Did the Irish parliament, in the reign of Anne, show a single spark of national feeling?

A. Yes; in 1709 a money-bill was thrown out, because the English privy-council had presumed to alter it.

Q. What do we learn from this fact?

A. That since the pressure of their own interests could sometimes impel even a parliament so anti-national as was that assembly, to the performance of a patriotic act, — the residence of an Irish legislature, harmonizing with the Irish people, and truly representing their wishes and interests, would be the best possible safeguard and promoter of the nation's prosperity.

Q. When did Queen Anne die?

A. In August, 1714.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

The Reign of George the First.

Q. Whilst the Irish parliament was employed in the enactment of restrictive laws against the Catholics, what advantage was taken by the English legislature of the national weakness thus created?

A. In the sixth year of George the First, the English parliament enacted a law, declaring itself possessed of full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the people of the kingdom of Ireland. The English parliament also deprived the Irish house of lords of its final jurisdiction in cases of appeal.

Q. Was not this a gross usurpation of power?

A. Of course it was; but Ireland, from the divisions between her inhabitants, was just then too weak to resist it.

Q. Was the Irish parliament, during this reign, engaged in imposing new penalties on the Catholics?

A. Yes; such was the infatuation of its bigotry, a bill was actually passed by both houses, which decreed a personal penalty on every Catholic ecclesiastic, of so revoltingly indecent a nature that it cannot be explicitly mentioned.

Q. Did that bill pass into a law?

A. No; Sir Robert Walpole, the English prime minister, exerted his influence, for very shame's sake, to procure its defeat in the English privy council.

Q. Who was Dean Swift?

A. An Irish Protestant divine of distinguished abilities. He combined both Protestants and Catholics in powerful opposition to a government scheme for empowering a man named Wood to coin copper money in Ireland. His "Drapier's Letters" which were written on this subject, obtained deserved celebrity at the time; and the spirit of resistance which he aroused succeeded in defeating the object of the government.

Q. When did George the First die?

A. In 1727.

CHAPTER XXIX.

The Reign of George the Second.

Q. What steps did the Catholics take on the accession of George the Second?

A. The nobility and gentry determined to present a loyal address to him.

Q. Was their address presented?

A. No; it was suppressed by the influence of Boulter, the Protestant primate, because he deemed it inconsistent with law that there should be any recognition of the existence of the Irish Catholics as a body in the state.

Q. Did the Irish house of commons protect the nation's purse in this reign?

A. Yes; in 1731 the government tried to get a grant of the supplies for twenty-one years; but the iniquitous effort was foiled by the commons.

Q. What was the Agistment Act?

A. An act passed in 1735, by which all pasture lands were exempted from tithe, or modus for tithe; and the Protestant clergy were only permitted to claim the tithe of tillage and meadow.

Q. Who was lord lieutenant of Ireland in 1745?

A. The celebrated earl of Chesterfield.

Q. Was he a judicious viceroy?

A. Yes; he discouraged informers against "Papists;" and conciliated the people of Ireland by mitigating the severities of the existing laws, so far as a mild administration could mitigate them.

Q. Were there not, however, two new penal laws passed during his viceroyalty?

A. Yes; one of these laws dissolved all marriages between Protestants and Papists; the other inflicted the penalty of death on every Catholic priest who should marry two Protestants, or a Protestant and Papist.

Q. In what year did Chesterfield leave Ireland?

A. In 1747.

Q. Who then acquired a leading power in the Irish government?

A. The Protestant primate, Dr. Stone; who, like his predecessor, Boulter, was an Englishman.

Q. What was Stone's policy?

A. He converted his house into a brothel, to win the support of the younger members of parliament to his measures, by pandering to their vices.

Q. What event occurred in 1759?

A. Carrickfergus was seized by a small French force under the command of Thurot; who, however, soon retired when he found that he was not sustained by the Catholic inhabitants.

Q. What important legislative measure was contemplated in that year?

A. Ministers projected a legislative Union between Ireland and England.

Q. Did the scheme succeed?

A. No; it was abandoned for the time. The people of Dublin were indignant at the design. They rushed into the house of lords, and compelled such members of both houses as they met, to take an oath that they never would

consent to the destruction of the Irish parliament.

Q. In what year did George the Second die?

A. In 1760.

CHAPTER XXX.

The Reign of George the Third.

Q. What change occurred in the constitution of the Irish parliament in the earlier part of the reign of George the Third?

A. The members of the house of commons had previously sat for life; but in 1768, they shortened the duration of each parliament to eight years.

Q. Who was at that time lord lieutenant?

A. Lord Townshend.

Q. What dispute arose between the court and the house of commons?

A. A money-bill had been prepared in England, and was submitted to the house of commons by the Irish minister; but the commons threw out the bill, because it had not originated with themselves.

Q. Did Lord Townshend protest against the rejection of the bill by the commons?

A. He did; but the house refused to enter his protest on their journals.

Q. In what year did the American colonies revolt from England?

A. In 1776.

Q. What effect had the assertion of American independence on the Irish people?

A. It stimulated them, by example, to assert

the freedom of their trade and the independence of their parliament.

Q. Did it furnish them with any facilities for this purpose?

A. Yes; by embarrassing England, which was then engaged in a war against the American states, and could not spare troops to overawe the Irish: for the period of England's difficulty and distress has ever been the period the most favorable to Irish freedom. England's extremity has always been Ireland's opportunity.

Q. Who were the Irish volunteers?

A. They were an army of citizen-soldiers who rose up to defend their country, which, in 1778, was threatened with a French invasion.

Q. Where did the enrolment of this citizen-army originate?

A. In Belfast. The people of that town had requested the government to send them a garrison.

Q. What was the answer of the government?

A. That they could not spare them more than half a troop of dismounted cavalry, and half a company of invalids.

Q. When the Belfast volunteers formed themselves into a corps for the national defence, was their example speedily followed by the other towns throughout the kingdom?

A. Yes; so speedily, that, within a few months, the volunteer army of Ireland amounted to 42,000 strong.

Q. What were the proceedings of the Irish parliament?

A. When the houses of parliament found themselves sustained by so powerful an army, they unanimously voted an address to the viceroy, declaring that the nation could only be preserved

from ruin by a free trade. They also voted resolutions of thanks to the different volunteer companies for their spirited patriotism.

Q. In what year was free trade carried by the Irish legislature?

A. In 1779.

Q. What was the celebrated resolution of the Dublin volunteers, presided over by the duke of Leinster, in 1780?

A. "*Resolved*, that the king, lords, and commons, of Ireland, only, were competent to make laws binding the subjects of this realm; and that they would not obey, nor give operation to any laws save only those enacted by the king, lords, and commons, of Ireland — whose rights and privileges, jointly and severally, they were determined to support with their lives and fortunes."

Q. Who were the principal leaders of the movement in favor of free trade, and a free parliament, for Ireland?

A. Henry Grattan, the duke of Leinster, the earl of Charlemont, Henry Flood, and several others. Grattan moved, and carried through the house of commons, in 1782, a Declaration of Rights, exactly identical in matter, and nearly so in words, with the resolution of the Dublin volunteers already quoted.

Q. Where did the volunteer convention meet?

A. At Dungannon, in February, 1782; and the bold and determined tone adopted by that body encouraged the patriots in parliament, and overawed the court party into acquiescence.

Q. How did the parliament testify its gratitude to Grattan, for his triumphant exertions to obtain legislative independence for Ireland?

A. The house of commons voted him a grant of fifty thousand pounds.

Q. What was the next money-vote of the Irish commons?

A. They voted one hundred thousand pounds to raise seamen for the service of England; thus giving a proof of the readiness of Ireland to assist the sister country, when exempt from the operation of British injustice.

Q. Of what religion were the leaders of the glorious movement of 1779–82?

A. They were Protestants. Some of them were descendants of the Cromwellian settlers; and their conduct demonstrates that the Protestant heart *can* warm to the cause of Irish freedom and prosperity, when uninfluenced by the visionary fears conjured up by designing bigots.

Q. What was the result of the commercial and constitutional victory obtained by the patriots?

A. Increase of trade, manufacture, and general prosperity, to an extent unparalleled in the annals of any other nation within so short a period.

Q. Did the Catholics obtain any relaxation of their grievances?

A. Yes; in 1782, the penal laws regarding property were all repealed, and the Catholics were placed on a level with Protestants as far as regarded the acquisition of land in freehold or in absolute fee.

Q. What great fault existed in the constitution of the Irish parliament?

A. The great number of small boroughs, which were under the absolute influence of private individuals, and entirely beyond the control of the people. The members nominated by these boroughs, at the dictation of their several patrons,

composed fully two thirds of the house, and were necessarily more liable to be corrupted by the court than genuine representatives of the people could have been.

Q. Were any efforts made to procure a reform of the parliament?

A. Yes; in 1783, Mr. Flood introduced a bill for that purpose into the commons. But it was rejected, through a copious application of court influence.

Q. What instance of English perfidy was exhibited in 1785?

A. The Irish commons had granted the minister new taxes to the amount £140,000, on the faith of his conceding to Ireland certain commercial advantages known as "the eleven propositions." The minister took the taxes, but, instead of conceding "the eleven propositions," he introduced a code of "twenty propositions," injurious to Irish commerce, which had been suggested by the leading English merchants.

Q. What was the fate of the twenty English propositions?

A. They encountered a powerful resistance in the Irish house of commons. The government were only able to muster a majority of nineteen in a very crowded house; and as there appeared every likelihood that this small support would be discontinued, the court withdrew the obnoxious measure, and the people exhibited their delight by extraordinary rejoicings and illuminations.

Q. What remarkable event occurred in 1789?

A. The king became insane; and the British and Irish parliaments concurred in appointing the prince of Wales regent during his majesty's incapacity. The British parliament fettered the

regent in the exercise of the royal authority, but the Irish legislature invested him with unlimited powers. The king, however, unexpectedly recovered, and resumed the exercise of the executive functions.

Q. How did successive administrations in Ireland thenceforward employ themselves?

A. In augmented efforts to corrupt the members of the Irish legislature.

Q. To what cause do you attribute the amount of success that attended those efforts of corruption?

A. To the fact that the Irish parliament was unreformed; that it was not sufficiently under the wholesome control of the people.

Q. In what year was the elective franchise conceded to the Catholics?

A. In 1793.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Reign of George the Third continued.

Q. What was the greatest crime the English government ever committed against Ireland?

A. The destruction of the Irish parliament, by the measure called the legislative Union.

Q. How did the government achieve that measure?

A. By goading a large portion of the people of Ireland into a premature rebellion, at the expense of a vast effusion of blood; and then, by taking advantage of the national weakness, confusion, and terror, thus created, to overawe the

people with 137,000 soldiers, and to bribe a majority of the members of parliament to vote for the Union.

Q. What steps were taken to goad the people to take up arms?

A. In 1795 their hopes were excited by the arrival of a popular and liberal nobleman, Earl Fitzwilliam, who came here as viceroy, with full powers, as was currently believed, to carry emancipation. After a few months, however, he was suddenly recalled, and a totally opposite policy was pursued under the auspices of his successor, Earl Camden.

Q. State some of the cruelties practised on the Catholics at that period.

A. "A persecution, accompanied with all the circumstances of ferocious cruelty, then raged in the country. Neither age nor sex, nor even acknowledged innocence, could excite mercy. The only crime with which the wretched objects were charged, was the profession of the Roman Catholic faith. A lawless banditti constituted themselves judges of this new delinquency, and the sentence they pronounced was equally concise and terrible. It was nothing less than confiscation of property, and immediate banishment."

Q. Whose words have you now repeated?

A. The words of Lord Gosford, a Protestant nobleman, in his address to the magistracy of Armagh, printed in the Dublin Journal, 5th January, 1796.

Q. Does Lord Gosford say that any of the armed Orange perpetrators of that persecution were punished for their crimes?

A. No; on the contrary he expressly says, in

the same address, "*These horrors are now acting with impunity.*"

Q. What other particulars of cruelty against the Catholic people are stated by Lord Moira?

A. Lord Moira, in his speech in the British house of lords, on the 22d of November, 1797, uses these words: "I have known a man, in order to extort confession of a supposed crime, or of that of some neighbor, picketed till he actually fainted; picketed a second time till he fainted again; and when he came to himself picketed a third time till he once more fainted, and all this upon mere suspicion."

Q. Does Lord Moira state any other particulars?

A. Yes; he says that "men had been taken and hung up till they were half dead, and afterwards threatened with a repetition of this treatment, unless they made a confession of their imputed guilt."

Q. What important fact does Lord Moira add?

A. He expressly says that "these were not particular acts of cruelty, *but formed part of the new system.*"

Q. What was the outrage at Carnew?

A. Twenty-eight men were brought out and deliberately murdered by the Orange yeomen and a party of the Antrim militia, on the 25th of May, 1798.

Q. How many men were shot without trial at Dunlavin?

A. Thirty-four.

Q. What tortures were familiarly practised by the yeomanry and soldiery against the people?

A Whipping, half-hanging, picketing; the hair of some of the victims was cut in the form

of a cross on the crowns of their heads, and the hollow thus formed strown with gunpowder, which was set fire to, and the process repeated till the sufferers fainted. There was also the torture of the pitch-cap, which consisted in applying a cap smeared with hot pitch to the shorn head of "a croppy," and dragging it forcibly off when the pitch hardened. The flesh was thus torn from the victim's head, and blinding was added to his other sufferings, as the melted pitch streamed down his forehead into his eyes. The cabins of the peasantry were burned, their sons tortured or murdered, and their daughters, in many instances, brutally violated by the armed demons whom the English government poured into the country.

Q. When did the people of Ireland, thus goaded to rise against the government, take the field against their oppressors?

A. The Kildare and Carlow peasantry commenced the insurrection on the 23d of May, 1798.

Q. How were they armed?

A. Wretchedly. Bad guns and pikes were their only weapons, and they had little or no discipline. Engagements took place with the royalists at Naas, Kilcullen, Carlow, (at all which towns the insurgents were defeated;) Oulart Hill, (where the insurgents were victorious;) Enniscorthy and Wexford, both which towns were taken by the insurgents; Newtownbarry and New Ross.

Q. Did the insurgents sully their cause with cruelties?

A. Unhappily some of them committed outrages, in the heat and turmoil of warfare, which we cannot regard without horror; such, for instance, as the burning of a number of royalist Catholics

and Protestants in the barn of Scullabogue, in the county Wexford.

Q. What excuse was pleaded by the perpetrators of that crime?

A. The massacres committed by the yeomanry at Carnew and Dunlavin. Horrible as was the conduct of the insurgents in the instance alluded to, it must however be owned, that a crime committed during the exasperation of a provoked rebellion falls far short, in point of demoniac atrocity, of the systematic outrages on property, liberty, and life, which the government had deliberately sanctioned and encouraged by impunity for years; and which, in fact, had at last stung the maddened people to resist their tyrants.

Q. At what other places were there engagements between the insurgents and the royalists?

A. At Arklow, where the royalists, under Colonel Skerrett, gained a victory; at Ballynahinch, where the rebels gained advantages, by their valor, which they lost by their total want of discipline; and at Vinegar Hill, where they were totally routed by the superior numbers, arms, and discipline, of the royal forces.

Q. Could the government have prevented the hideous and sanguinary outrages, and the awful waste of human life, which marked the civil war of 1798? Did they possess sufficient information of the rebel plans to enable them to avert the explosion of the rebellion?

A. Yes; they had in their pay a spy in the camp of the insurgents, named M'Guane, who was one of the colonels of the United Irishmen. This man gave the government constant and minute information of every plan and every movement contemplated by the United Irishmen, for fully ten months

before the insurrection exploded; so that, at any moment during those ten months, the government could have crushed the rebellion with the utmost ease, by the simple act of arresting the leaders.

Q. Who were the leaders?

A. Lord Edward Fitzgerald, son of the Duke of Leinster; Beauchamp Bagenal Harvey, a Protestant gentleman of ancient family and good estate; Arthur O'Connor of Connorville, county Cork; Neilson; M'Nevin, and a long list of others, — being about 45 in all, of whom nearly the entire were Protestants.

Q. Why did not the government quietly crush the rebellion in its infancy, or rather prevent its explosion, and thus avert the horrible destruction of human life?

A. Because its object was to carry the legislative Union; and *that* could not be done unless the country were first thoroughly exhausted by the paralyzing influences of terror and mutual distrust among its inhabitants, and thereby rendered incapable of resisting the destruction of its parliament.

Q. Did the gentry and people make any efforts to preserve their parliament?

A. They did; their efforts were astonishing, when we reflect that the country was under martial law, and was occupied by an adverse army 137,000 strong. They signed petitions against the Union, to the number of 707,000 signatures; whilst all the signatures the government could obtain in favor of the measure amounted to no more than about 3000; — though schools were canvassed for the names of their pupils, and jails raked for the names of criminals.

Q. When was the question of Union first brought before the Irish parliament?

A. In 1799. It was rejected that year by a majority of the Irish house of commons.

Q. What was the conduct of Pitt, and his Irish colleague, Castlereagh, on this defeat?

A. They redoubled their efforts to bribe the Irish members during the recess. Peerages, bishopricks, seats on the bench, commands in the army and navy, were familiarly given in exchange for votes for the Union. One million and a half sterling was distributed in money-bribes. There was in the lower house a vast preponderance of borough members, who were peculiarly accessible to the tempter; of these there were no less than 116 placemen and pensioners in immediate dependence on the government. Several members, who could not bring themselves to vote for the destruction of their native legislature, yet vacated their seats for the admission of Englishmen and Scotchmen, who readily voted away a parliament in the continuance of which they had no sort of interest.

Q. When did that act of national degradation and disaster, the legislative Union, receive the sanction of the bribed parliament?

A. In 1800; and it came into operation on the 1st of January, 1801.

Q. What members particularly distinguished themselves in opposition to it?

A. Grattan, Plunket, Bushe, Saurin, Foster (the speaker), Ponsonby, and Jebb.

Q. What was the motive which stimulated the English government to commit so enormous a crime against Ireland as the destruction, by such means, of the Irish parliament?

A. In the words of Charles Kendal Bushe, the motive of the government was "an intolerance

of Irish prosperity." They hated Ireland with intense fierceness, from ancient national prejudice. Pitt also had his own peculiar quarrel with the Irish parliament from its opposition to his views on the regency question, in 1789; and the growth of Ireland in happiness, in greatness, in prosperity, in domestic harmony, and consequent strength, was altogether insupportable to our jealous English foes; who, accordingly, were reckless in the means they used to deprive this country of the power, which self-legislation alone can afford, of fully promoting its own interests and unfolding its own resources.

Q. What have been the consequences of the Union?

A. The destruction of numerous branches of Irish trade and manufactures; an enormous increase of the drain of absentee rents, which now exceed four millions a year; the drain of surplus taxes to the amount of between one and two millions annually; the alienation from Ireland of the affections of the gentry, whom intercourse with dominant England infects with a contempt for their native land; the scornful refusal of Irish rights; — all which evils are the natural consequences of our being governed by a foreign parliament, whose members regard with apathy at best, and too often with contemptuous hostility, the country thus surrendered to their control.

Q. What is the duty of all Irishmen with regard to the Union?

A. To get rid of it as fast as they can — by all legal, peaceful, and constitutional means.

Q. What were the principal measures affecting Ireland passed by the imperial parliament

during the rest of the reign of George the Third?

A. Chiefly insurrection acts and suspensions of the *habeas corpus*, to put down the disturbances to which oppression incited the people.

Q. Was there any fiscal measure passed?

A. Yes; the Irish exchequer was consolidated with that of England in 1816.

Q. What was the result of this consolidation?

A. To give the English minister more complete control over the taxation of Ireland, and in general over all her fiscal resources.

Q. What part did the Irish soldiery bear in the wars of the allied sovereigns against Bonaparte?

A. They fought with national bravery for their old oppressor, England, in all her campaigns; and materially contributed to the victory of Waterloo, in 1814.

Q. In what year did George the Third die?

A. In 1820.

CHAPTER XXXII.

The Reigns of George the Fourth and William the Fourth.

Q. What notable event occurred in 1821?

A. George the Fourth came to Ireland, where he spent three weeks in idle pageantry.

Q. What was the political object of his visit?

A. To delude the Catholics with empty civilities in place of substantial concessions.

Q. Were the Catholics thus deluded?

A. No; Daniel O'Connell, a Catholic barrister of high eminence, assumed the leadership of his fellow-religionists. He founded the Catholic Association — which originally consisted of only seven members, but soon embraced within its circle all the friends of civil and religious liberty in the empire.

Q. Was the Catholic Association successful?

A. Yes; it combined and organized the people so extensively and so powerfully, that their efforts became irresistible; and O'Connell's experiment of working out a great political change, by appeals to public opinion alone, had a signal triumph.

Q. When was emancipation conceded?

A. In April, 1829.

Q. Who were the leaders of the measure in the English parliament?

A. Sir Robert Peel in the commons, and the duke of Wellington in the lords.

Q. What declarations did those statesmen make?

A. That their old opinions (which were adverse to the measure) were unchanged; but that they deemed it expedient to grant it rather than risk a civil war.

Q. What offices and places did emancipation throw open to the Catholics?

A. All offices in the state excepting only the throne, the viceroyalty of Ireland, and the office of lord chancellor in both countries.

Q. In what year did George the Fourth die?

A. In 1830, aged 68.

Q. What events took place in Ireland in the reign of William the Fourth?

A In 1832 there was a resistance, almost universal, to the tithe system. Cattle, corn, or goods, distrained for tithe, could find no purchasers; and the clergy of the Established Church were involved in litigation with their parishioners all over the kingdom.

Q. Were other weapons than those of the law made use of to enforce the payment of tithe?

A. Yes; the clergy obtained the assistance of the military to distrain the property of the people, and to overawe them into obedience. Scenes ludicrous as well as deplorable occurred. A regiment of hussars was employed in driving a flock of twelve geese in the county of Kilkenny. At Newtownbarry, Castlepollard, Carrickshock, Inniscarra, and some other places, there were sanguinary affrays between the soldiers and the people.

Q. What occurred at Gurtroe, near Rathcormac, in the county of Cork?

A. Archdeacon Ryder brought a party of the military to recover the tithe of a farm held by a family named Ryan. The Ryans, who were Catholics, resisted the payment of tithe to a Protestant pastor, from whom they, of course, derived no spiritual benefit. The order to fire on the people was given to the military; and thirteen persons were wounded, and eight killed, in the presence of the Rev. Mr. Ryder. He was then paid his tithe by Mrs. Ryan, whose son was shot before her eyes.

Q. What changes did parliament make in the tithe system?

A. It struck off one fourth of the tithes, and made the landlords, instead of the occupying ten-

ants, liable to the Established clergy for the remaining three fourths.

Q. Was this a relief to the tenantry?

A. To the extent of one fourth of the tithes, it was, doubtless, a relief. With respect to the other three fourths, as the landlords are liable to pay them to the clergy, they, of course, take care to exact them, under the name of rent, from their tenantry.

Q. Was a reform of the house of commons carried in this reign?

A. Yes.

Q. How far did that reform affect Ireland?

A. Ireland got five additional members. She had previously sent 100 representatives to the imperial Parliament.

Q. Did the Irish, in 1832, make any efforts to obtain a repeal of the Union?

A. Yes; and about forty members were returned at the general election in that year pledged to support the repeal. Only that the elective franchise was unjustly withheld from the people, nearly all the constituencies would have returned repealers.

Q. What measure did the first reformed parliament enact against Ireland, in 1833?

A. A coercion act was passed, laying restrictions on the right of the Irish people to meet and petition the legislature. The object of this act was to crush the movement for repeal; which national measure was denounced in a foolish and ferocious speech delivered by the king on opening the session.

Q. How did Mr. O'Connell, in his place in parliament, designate the king's speech?

A. He called it "a brutal and a bloody speech."

Q. Was repeal brought before the British house of commons?

A. Yes; by O'Connell, in 1834. He was opposed by Spring Rice, who attempted to show that Ireland had been improved by the destruction of her parliament; and as Mr. Rice's paradox was congenial to the prejudices of his audience, O'Connell's motion was defeated, for the time, by an immense majority.

Q. Did that defeat discourage the Irish people?

A. Not in the least. They knew their cause was just and righteous, and they determined to wait, and work, and watch their opportunity.

Q. What was O'Connell's parliamentary policy?

A. To act as if he placed faith in the conjoint promise made by the king, lords, and commons, in rejecting his motion for repeal. They had solemnly promised to remove all the grievances of Ireland; and accordingly O'Connell, for the next six years, occupied himself in the experiment of extorting a fulfilment of that solemn pledge from the British legislature.

Q. In what year did William the Fourth die?

A. In 1837.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

The Reign of Queen Victoria.

Q. What was the policy of the national party in Ireland for the first three years of this reign?

A. They continued to pursue the experiment of trying what amount of justice was to be obtained from the imperial parliament.

Q. What was the result of their experiment?

A. Increased evidence of the hostility of that parliament to Ireland; and of the paramount necessity of obtaining a free, popular Irish legislature.

Q. What important event occurred in 1840?

A. The Loyal National Repeal Association was founded by O'Connell in that year, for the purpose of obtaining a repeal of the Union.

Q. Did the agitation for repeal extend itself quickly over the kingdom?

A. Yes; as soon as O'Connell's perseverance had finally convinced the people that he was thoroughly resolved to fight out the peaceful battle to the last, and not to use the repeal-cry as a mere instrument to obtain other measures.

Q. What efforts did the government make to preserve the Union?

A. Efforts quite in character with those which Pitt's government had made use of to carry it, in 1800. They deemed that, as it had been originally achieved by bribery and terror, it could best be preserved by the same means. Accordingly, Lord Fortescue, the Whig lord lieutenant in 1841, announced that anti-repealers only should be admitted to any place or office in the gift of the government; and in 1843, troops were poured into the country, and state prosecutions instituted against nine of the leaders, in the hope that the display of military power, conjoined with the harassing prosecution of the legal proceedings, might terrify the people from seeking their national rights.

Q. What military struggle occurred in the English colonies in 1841–2?

A. England was engaged in the attempt to extend and consolidate her Indian empire; and Irish soldiers, as is usual in such cases, fought and

bled in the contest. The 44th regiment, consisting entirely of Irish, was totally destroyed.

Q. Of what use were England's Indian conquests to Ireland?

A. Of no use whatever. Ireland had no interest whatsoever in the event of the struggle.

Q. Did the English ministry enlist Queen Victoria's influence against the repealers of Ireland?

A. They did; and a speech, denouncing repeal, was composed for the queen, which her majesty read from the throne at the close of the session of 1843. The ministry hoped that the well-known loyalty of the Irish people would induce them to abandon a measure distasteful to their beloved monarch.

Q. What effect had this ministerial manœuvre on the national policy of the Irish?

A. It deeply grieved the people to see the amiable young lady on the throne made the tool and mouth-piece of a faction opposed to their liberties; but the queen's mistake on the subject of repeal could, of course, have no effect on the national resolve of millions suffering the bitter evils of the Union. Their sentiment was precisely the same as that which was expressed by the Dungannon volunteers in 1779: "We know our duty to our sovereign, and are loyal; but we also know our duty to ourselves, and are determined to be free."

Q. What violent measures did the government take, to suppress the agitation for repeal?

A. The lord lieutenant (Earl De Grey) issued a proclamation to prevent a public meeting, to petition parliament for repeal, which was advertised to be held at Clontarf on the 8th of Oc-

tober, 1843; and at which a large number from great distances, and even from England, had prepared to attend. The viceregal proclamation was issued at so late an hour on the 7th, that it was perfectly impossible to convey the knowledge of its contents to tens of thousands who were actually at the moment on their journey to the meeting.

Q. What additional measures did the government take?

A. A large military force was stationed in the neighborhood, so disposed as to command, from several points, the place intended for the meeting.

Q. Did the people obey the proclamation?

A. Yes; owing to the prompt energy of the Repeal Committee, who felt it their bounden duty to prevent a hostile collision; and who accordingly sent messengers in all directions to enjoin the people to return to their homes.

Q. When were the leaders of the repeal movement prosecuted?

A. The prosecution was commenced in the November term, 1843.

Q. Name the traversers.

A. Daniel O'Connell, John O'Connell, Thomas Steele, Charles Gavan Duffy (editor of the *Nation*), John Gray (editor of the *Freeman's Journal*), Richard Barret (editor of the *Pilot*), Rev. Mr. Tyrrell, P. P. of Lusk, Rev. Mr. Tierney, P. P. of Clontibret, and Thomas Matthew Ray, the secretary of the Repeal Association. The Rev. Mr. Tyrrell died before the close of the prosecution, and the verdict against the Rev. Mr. Tierney was overruled by the bench.

Q. How did the government secure a conviction?

A. By excluding from the jury-box every man

who did not entertain political hostility to the defendants. The management of the jury-list was pronounced by the Tory chancellor of England (Baron Lyndhurst) to have been "*fraudulent.*"

Q. Were the seven traversers imprisoned on the verdict of the jury?

A. Yes, on the 30th of May, 1844.

Q. Did their fate deter the Irish people from further exertions for repeal?

A. Of course it did not! On the contrary, the people, indignant at the outrage committed on their leaders under the forms of law, immediately began to work with augmented energy; there was an immense increase of the Repeal Rent, and a large number of new adhesions to the Repeal Association.

Q. What length of imprisonment was adjudged to the traversers?

A. One year to Daniel O'Connell; and nine months to the others.

Q. Did they suffer the full term of their sentence?

A. No; they appealed by writ of error to the house of lords, and that tribunal reversed the judgment of the court below. The prisoners were forthwith discharged, having been imprisoned for over three months.

Q. How many members of the house of lords formed the tribunal that decided the appeal in this case?

A. The five law lords — Lyndhurst, Brougham, Cottenham, Campbell, Denman. The first two were for confirming the sentence; the last three for reversing it.

Q. What were Lord Denman's words in giving judgment?

A. "IF SUCH PRACTICES AS HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THE PRESENT INSTANCE IN IRELAND SHALL CONTINUE, THE TRIAL BY JURY WILL BECOME A MOCKERY, A DELUSION, AND A SNARE."

Q. On what day were the prisoners liberated?

A. On the 6th of September, 1844.

Q. What qualities characterized the Irish people during the entire crisis — the trial, the imprisonment, the liberation?

A. The utmost steadiness and determination of purpose, combined with a careful abstinence from all violent and exasperating language. There never was a nation that more fully developed its own capacity for self-government than the Irish did at that very trying crisis. The people and their leaders are pledged to persevere. The issue of their struggle is in the hands of God; but if the thorough justice of a cause, and the perfect morality of the means employed in its promotion, may command success, the final triumph of Repeal can neither be distant nor doubtful.

FINIS.

O'CONNELL AND HIS FRIENDS.

BY THOMAS D. M'GEE.

This popular work has already gone through two editions. It is published by PATRICK DONAHOE, No. 1, Spring Lane.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"It treats principally of Daniel O'Connell, and sketches off the great man with accuracy and eloquence; but there are in it lively sketches of many others, such as Sheil, Lawless, Dr. Doyle, Moore, Furlong, etc. Its appearance in America, written and published by an Irishman, is a healthy indication." — *Boston Reporter.*

"We warmly commend it to the public as a faithful biography of an important class of public men — the Irish 'Agitators.' It is remarkable for the multiplicity of its facts, the eloquence of its descriptions of men and events, and the orthodoxy of its general reflections on politics and government." — *Boston Times.*

"The author is, of course, strongly in arms for O'Connell; but we may mention that his volume contains numerous anecdotes of the leading men of Ireland, which are very interesting, and not to be found elsewhere." — *Boston Post.*

"It is a volume which should be in the hands of every man who values human rights, and feels it a national duty to do honor to the noble spirits who have battled fearlessly in the cause of humanity and their country." — *Phil. Spirit of the Times.*

"It is written with much care, talent, and variety of illustration. We wish it every success." — *N. Y. Freeman's Journal.*

"It is well executed, and will be found a valuable reference in relation to the character and doings of an important personage, and to the present condition and future prospects of a far-famed and oppressed people." — *Christian Freeman.*

"To those who feel an interest in this very extraordinary man, this work is of great value, as it gives a strong picture of O'Connell and his friends, viewed from the most favorable point. Mr. M'Gee shows much tact and considerable talent in this work." — *Olive Branch.*

"It is from the pen of Thomas D. M'Gee, a popular and elegant writer." — *Troy Daily Budget.*

THE SPANISH INQUISITION.

Count Le Maistre's celebrated "LETTERS ON THE SPANISH INQUISITION;" translated, with copious Notes and a Preface, by the Rev. Dr. O'Flaherty, Catholic Pastor of Salem, Mass. For sale by the Publisher, P. Donahoe, No. 1, Spring Lane.

THE SPIRIT OF THE NATION.

P. Donahoe has also issued a cheap and accurate edition of these far-famed national lyrics of Ireland, which may be had, at the usual wholesale prices, of himself or agents.

THE BOSTON PILOT

Is published at No. 1 Spring Lane, by Patrick Donahoe, at $2,50, in advance, or $3 at the end of the year. It is the largest and cheapest paper of the class in America, and is devoted to Catholicity, and a defence of the Irish character.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: JAN 2001
PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066

APR 79
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

0 007 370 204 5